DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 407 AC 004 371

By-Burch, Glen

Challenge to the University; An Inquiry into the University's Responsibility for Adult Education. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, 35.

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.

Pub Date Feb 61

Note-85p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.35

Descriptors-Administrative Organization, *Community Services, Cooperative Planning, Credit Courses, *Educational Responsibility, Financial Policy, Historical Reviews, Instructional Staff, Noncredit Courses, Program Descriptions, Program Planning, *Role Perception, *Universities, *University Extension

An exploration was made of trends in continuing education at the University of California (Berkeley and Los Angeles), Michigan, Michigan State, Oregon State, Wayne University, Illinois, Harvard, New York University, the University of Chicago, and several other universities. The university was discussed as basically a community of scholars, and an assessment was made of what its role is, or should be, in society. Examples were provided of conventional extension education, broadly based educational services, and professional and general continuing education. Certain issues faced in organizing for service were examined: whether such service is to be integral or peripheral; whether to stress formal credit programs or informal noncredit work; whether programs will be centralized or decentralized; whether faculty members or nonfaculty will be used and on what basis, and whether services should be subsidized or required to be self-supporting. A trend was seen toward greater cooperation, and in some cases coordination, in relationships with other universities; instances of both were described. Finally, a four-dimensional educational system, incorporating continuing education with primary, secondary, and higher education, was urged. (ly)

ED028407

Dlg.

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

CHALLENGE TO THE UNIVERSITY: AN INQUIRY INTO THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADLUT EDUCATION.

AC004371

ED028407

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR ADULTS **35**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Doris Chertow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSID THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CHALLENGE TO THE UNIVERSITY

AN INQUIRY INTO THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADULT EDUCATION

GLEN BURCH

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

AC 004 371

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL, *Clark University*
JAMES T. CAREY, *University of California*
JOHN S. DIEKHOFF, *Western Reserve University*
JOHN P. DYER, *Tulane University*
CYRIL O. HOULE, *University of Chicago*
H. LICHTENSTEIN, *Hofstra College*
JACK LONDON, *University of California*
ERNEST E. MCMAHON, *Rutgers University*
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, *New York University*
ALAN M. THOMAS, *The University of British Columbia*
CLIFFORD L. WINTERS, *Syracuse University*

CENTER PUBLICATIONS

Center publications on education of adults include the *Notes and Essays* series examining purposes and innovations, *Reports* on methods and practices in the field, *Research Reports*, monographs, and journal reprints.

For a complete list and prices write:

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
4819 S. Greenwood Ave.
Chicago 15, Illinois

CHALLENGE TO THE UNIVERSITY

AN INQUIRY INTO THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADULT EDUCATION

GLEN BURCH
University Extension Specialist
University of California Extension Division

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**

THE CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS** was established as the result of a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with the universities providing liberal education for adults. The official purpose of the Center is to "provide aid and leadership to the forces that can develop the evening college and extension movement into a more effective instrument for the liberal education of adults." Communications may be addressed to the Director, 4819 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois.

Copyright 1961 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. All rights reserved.

Published February 1961

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

LC
6251
no. 35
c. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

One: "The Universal Predicament": Overview of the Present Situation 7

Two: The University and Its Service Function 12

Three: Issues To Be Resolved 26

Four: Competition, Cooperation, and Coordination 49

Five: Summary—and Some Conclusions 62

"As long as evolution proceeded slowly over centuries men could feel their way and make adjustments imperceptibly on an empirical basis. But the restraints which for centuries slowed down or limited adjustments have been largely removed. Societies have to act—intelligently if possible—if not, then unintelligently, blindly, selfishly, impulsively. The weight and prestige of the university must be thrown on the side of intelligence. If the university does not accept the challenge—what other institution can—or will?"

Abraham Flexner, in Universities—
American, English, German.

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1959 the Executive Committee of The Fund for Adult Education commissioned me to undertake an exploration of trends in continuing education in a group of arbitrarily selected American universities.

One of the members of the Committee put the nature of the assignment very succinctly. "I think what we'd like you to do is to try to get answers of some kind to three related questions: (1) What's happening to universities that is related to continuing education? (2) Why is it happening? (3) What do the people it's happening to think it means?"

Universities Visited

The institutions initially selected for attention were: the Universities of California (Los Angeles and Berkeley), Michigan, and Illinois; Michigan State University; Wayne State University; and three private universities: Harvard University, New York University, and the University of Chicago.[1]

There was no particular rationale for the choice of these universities, beyond the fact that they represented interesting and different institutional situations.

The University of California not only possessed the largest university extension division in the country; this division was operating in a state which also supported extensive adult education activities under state college, junior college, and public school auspices.

The three publicly supported universities in Michigan—the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Wayne University—presented still another problem. The University of Michigan was one of the oldest and most respected state universities in the country; Michigan State had, in a little over 15 years, emerged from the status of an agricultural college to a full-fledged university, with one of the pioneer Continuing Education Centers in the country. Wayne was an outstanding urban university. All three were supported from taxes on citizens in the same state, and faced common problems in coordinating activities.

---

[1] Later on brief visits were made to several institutions in the Greater Boston area (Tufts, Wellesley, Boston University, Boston College, Simmons College, Brandeis University, Northeastern University, M.I.T.), to three California state colleges (San Jose, San Francisco, and San Diego), and to the universities of Wisconsin and Washington, the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and Columbia University.

Illinois was one of the great land grant colleges housing both a distinguished university extension operation and an agricultural extension service.

The University of Chicago was the home of one of the pioneer ventures in university extension, and had contributed more innovations in higher adult education than any other private university in the country.

New York University's Division of General Education has long enjoyed an international reputation for its distinguished non-credit courses for adults.

Harvard University was a pioneer in developing a unique cooperative venture in adult education in the Boston area—the Commission on Extension Teaching.

I spent from a week to ten days on each campus. There I interviewed deans of various colleges, heads of departments, faculty members especially interested in (or opposed to) university extension activities, members of the central administrative staff, and, of course, members of the university's extension staff. In most of the universities I was able to talk with the president. The choice of those interviewed was necessarily random. It all depended on who was on campus and available for conference at the time of my visit.

The interviews were completely informal and usually lasted from one to two hours. Originally I had planned to work from a four-page questionnaire, but after trying it out in test interviews, I abandoned this idea as too rigid and cumbersome to be fruitful. The most effective procedure seemed to be to work from a general question like "What responsibilities do you think this university should assume for continuing education?" and then probe for definitions and specific examples.

I spent a good deal of time in university libraries looking up documents, histories, announcements, financial reports. I did a good deal of reading up on universities and university extension—just enough to make me realize how little I knew about either of them. At the end of each field trip I submitted a report on findings to the Executive Committee.

A "Freewheeling" Venture

When I began this inquiry I had no clear idea what specific things I was supposed to be looking for. I gathered a good deal of information which turned out to be irrelevant, and I neglected to collect other information which would have been invaluable. I varied my procedures from campus to campus.

In the truest sense of that much over-used term, this was a "freewheeling" venture, an exercise in understanding. It was not an investigation so much as it was preparation for an investigation.

I came early to certain convictions which to a less naive investigator would have been self-evident from the start, and which served as guiding principles for the inquiry: (1) that the continuing education activities of a given university must be appraised within the context of the institution in which it exists; and (2) that a given university has to be examined against the geographic area in which it exists, or for which it was established, and/or the "publics" it is presumed to serve.

As the exploration progressed, I found that it shaped up as an examination of the patterns of relationships that seemed to exist *within* universities (among faculty, administration, and extension personnel) and among universities and other educational institutions presumably serving the same people.

Questions, Questions, Questions!

How did faculty members, deans, administrators *feel* about their university's "service" function? What did they think of extension personnel? What did they think their university should be doing in this field of continuing education?

Within what kind of an administrative structure did the extension division operate? How much cooperation, if any, did it get from the faculty in policy making?

How did the university see itself, and its extension activities, in relation to other educational institutions and *their* extension activities?

These, and related questions, intruded themselves.

I did not get many "answers." I cannot report, with conviction, any clear-cut "trends."

But I began to glimpse the outlines of some major issues that face universities as they come to grips with the question of what to do about their "service" function.

It is around these issues, and the various ways universities seek to cope with them, that this report has been built.

Preview of the Report

Throughout this report I am groping for a way of putting an old problem into a new perspective. Instead of taking the conventional approach of trying to state the problem of continuing education in terms of individual needs and interests, I have tried to put it in terms of institutional obligations.

The report as a whole is intended to answer, at least in part, the three questions posed by the Executive Committee of the Fund. In other words, it is a report on significant changes taking place in university extension divisions as seen by an observer who does not regularly dwell in those regions.

This question of the viewpoint of the observer is important and explains the content of a considerable part of the report. Any description of significant changes taking place is necessarily shaped by the observer's judgments of just what happenings are indeed significant, in what respects, and why. The evaluative stance assumed by the observer would be an evident determining factor in his conclusions even if it were not explicitly stated. But for the sake of clarity I have tried, in the early part of this report, to state at least briefly some of the underlying assumptions and definitions by which I have been guided in my explorations.

Since the institution under examination is the university, the first question is not "what needs and interests can the university meet" or even "what is the role of the university in continuing education," but "what is the university" and "what is, or should be, its role in our society." Chapters One and Two are my attempt to reply to these questions (about which, of course, volumes have been and may be written). I have accepted the simplest of answers. Stripping away all the elaborate institutional paraphernalia that currently encrusts it—the university is, in essence, a community of scholars. The purposes of this community are the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge.

This concept, coupled with these purposes, has been attached to the university in western culture for several hundred years. However, in this country in the last fifty years there has been a good deal of talk about a third function: service. This function has never been clearly defined, nor wholeheartedly accepted, by the university viewed as a community of scholars.

Examining the service function through examples of the way it has been carried out in most universities, one finds—broadly speaking—three types of activities: (1) extension education—the provision of "regular" university credit courses to people who cannot enroll full-time in the university proper; (2) educational services—those activities of an informal nature which the university puts on in response to requests from special groups in the community; and (3) continuing education—those activities which the university initiates and conducts for people who have completed their formal schooling. The types overlap, and have to be viewed as indicative of various attitudes taken by the university as it approaches the fulfillment of its service function.

Chapter Three deals with certain issues faced by universities in organizing themselves to fulfill the service function—whatever the attitude taken. These include: (1) whether the fulfillment of the service function is to be considered an integral or a peripheral function; (2) whether the work is to be handled as a separate operation (centralized) or undertaken by the individual schools and colleges within the universities (decentralized); (3) whether the emphasis is to be on formal credit-bearing activities, or on informal non-credit work; (4) whether the work is to be handled by regular faculty members or non-faculty members—and on what basis; and finally, (5) whether the service function is supposed to support itself or be considered eligible for subsidy.

On the assumption that no university today in its particular "service area" could determine the nature and extent of its service function without reference to the service activities of other institutions of higher education, and other educational institutions, I turn next (Chapter Four) to the whole problem of relations of institutions with each other: competition, cooperation, and coordination.

The final chapter of the report contains a summary and some conclusions drawn from my exploration.

Since, as was mentioned earlier, this exploration must begin from my view of what, in essence, the institution I am examining is, I have devoted the pages immediately following to an overview of the university—its present, its past, its essential and traditional concerns.

ONE: "THE UNIVERSAL PREDICAMENT": OVERVIEW OF THE PRESENT SITUATION

Universities, like everything else in our culture, are growing. Some are getting very large. There are more than a hundred institutions of higher learning in our country that call themselves "universities." More than 40 of them have enrollments of more than 10,000. Nine of these have more than 20,000.

Universities are getting to be big business. (A recent budget for the University of California totaled more than 250 million dollars.) Student fees seem to rise every other year, but in most institutions they account for but a small proportion of the total needed income.

Universities are getting more and more complex. Schools, colleges, institutes, and miscellaneous auxiliary units within the institutions are increasing. (The list of the University of Michigan's "constituent administrative units" totals 245.) There are a great variety of different course offerings. (A recent New York University catalog listed 115 in education alone.) In the wake of this expansion of units and courses, operation of Parkinson's law has brought about a considerable increase in administrative posts.

Because of increase in size and complexity, schools and colleges within the large universities are becoming isolated from each other. So are departments and divisions within these units. As a result, individual faculty members from different areas tend more and more to become "alienated." Allegiance is given to the "discipline" (anthropology, economics, English, etc.) rather than to the institution. Loyalty to the university as an educational enterprise to which all have a common commitment, in which all are commonly engaged, is being eroded. The enterprise itself is tending to become so diffuse as to lose meaning.

The "Ivory Tower" Today

The university as a "community of scholars" is today an embattled concept. The ivory tower is losing tenants. "Our problem," said one university president rather plaintively, "is not: 'How do you get the professor out of his ivory tower, but how do you keep him in! '"

Involvement of faculty members in remunerative "outside" teaching, research, and consultation activities (in addition to those which are taken on by universities as contract work) seems also to be on the rise in some universities. This is due to (1) low salaries (university salary increases have not been able to keep pace with a mounting cost of living); (2) high cost of living in university towns (Berkeley and Ann Arbor are—I'm told—more expensive to live in than neighboring cities); (3) increasing demand for professional (faculty) part-time services—particularly in the fields of social and natural sciences—from government agencies and business and industry. (Two national drug firms recently established research units in Ann Arbor.)

Many faculty members are also finding a variety of assignments—teaching, consultation, outside research—more interesting than straight teaching or academic research. "Let's face it," said one NYU professor, "many teachers in universities today are bored with their work. Too many students, they say, are not interested in learning; only in getting a degree. Picking up interesting assignments on the side becomes the thing to do." Another remarked on this same subject, "For some the university seems to be becoming a base of operations rather than an operation in itself."

Examination of sources of income of many universities—public and private—shows a rise in funds for contract research and special projects of one kind or another.

Reliable data on just how much of any given university's resources is being devoted annually to the fulfillment of research contracts with industry and government agencies, and to special foundation projects, are difficult to get. An examination, however, of the annual budgets of the universities included in this investigation shows a steady—and sometimes phenomenal—increase in income derived from these sources over the past ten years. (For example, in the three-year period, 1956 to 1958, the University of California budget grew from $173,199,756 to $252,566,248. In this same period the "special purpose" funds of the University grew from $100,456,717 to $153,337,493.)

Faculty and administrators have differing views on the effect of this increase on the university as a whole. Some argue that it is a good thing, a healthy development. They point out that most large universities are becoming both regional and national (and even international) in scope and therefore must look to other than state funds for support. Federal contracts, they say, may be viewed as a form of federal aid to higher education. Involvement in these service activities—whether in research, teaching, or consultation—has brought the professors into direct acquaintance with the problems of the "outside" world, and therefore improved the quality of their work. Much of the special research—particularly in the social and physical sciences which limited-purpose grants and contracts have made possible—has been of great value as an important aspect of long range "basic" research. Furthermore, it has enabled universities to get and keep men of high calibre they would otherwise not be able to afford. Finally, they argue, universities have an obligation in these critical days to do all they can to help solve the immediately pressing problems of this changing world.

Critics, on the other hand, complain that all this is resulting in a slow erosion of other important functions of the university. They associate this rise in the "service" function of the university with a decline in the quality of university teaching generally—and in particular with a decline in the quality of teaching at the undergraduate level. Too large a percentage of the time of too many of the best qualified professors is being siphoned off into specialized projects. Furthermore, these "other-directed" ventures have introduced a growing group of "second-class citizens" onto university campuses: men and women who are not regular faculty appointees; hold no academic rank or appointment in regular schools or departments; are unfamiliar with, and often uninterested in, campus and faculty traditions; and therefore never become a part of the university. Friction often ensues because of disparity in status and salaries. With a larger and larger share of the university's over-all income coming from special contracts and grants, some universities—so the critics say—are finding themselves caught in a vicious circle. Like professors who get accustomed to a standard of living which can be sustained only by "outside" work, these universities are being forced to set up (in one form or another) "development offices" to solicit contracts, grants, etc., in order to maintain a constantly increasing over-all income level.

In this sort of situation—critics point out—the university tends to lose the initiative in establishing goals for research and education, being always under greater and greater pressure to adapt to the special needs and interests of those who want the service and will pay the bill.

Interdependence

Finally the university, particularly the publicly supported university, increasingly is being made aware of its interdependence with other agencies of formal education in society. There was a time when the state universities—together with a few of the large private universities—were the undisputed lords of higher education. But recent years have seen the rapid rise of teachers' colleges to state colleges, and in some instances to full-fledged universities. Now a movement is spreading to introduce liberal arts curricula into the state agricultural colleges and convert them to universities. This has brought an inevitable increase in inter-institutional tensions.

There is a growing demand in state legislatures for coordination, due to the increasing complexity and cost of higher education and of state government, of all state-supported institutions of higher education. This places upon universities the painful duty of reappraisal of functions, in the light of functions being performed by other institutions looking to the same source of support.

This growing awareness of interdependence has prompted many universities to take on a new responsibility: helping community colleges and junior colleges in their respective areas of service to improve their scholastic standards to the point where their better students can qualify for university upper division work.

Then you have to add to all this the "normal" problems of a university: planning for increased enrollments; making necessary curriculum changes to meet new requirements of society; getting money for new buildings and equipment, etc.

And over the campus floats the (to some) dark cloud of educational television—now no bigger than a man's hand. Administrators hope it has a silver lining in improved teaching, and eventually reduced building and instructional costs. But to many of the faculty—despite assurances that it will bring relief from routine teaching—it looks a little ominous. They're afraid that soon the first sprinkling of automation will be falling on the teaching profession.

The Problem of Extension

In the midst of this situation of rapid change and burgeoning institutional difficulties, universities are today trying to come to grips with the problem of what to do about their rapidly proliferating extension activities.

This is a problem never squarely faced by most universities. Even some that have accepted the function for fifty years have shown a tendency to tolerate it, rather than give it a firm sense of place and direction. Extension personnel are too often regarded as second-class citizens in the academic community. But extension divisions have grown along with the universities. Energetic directors have added certain functions; outside pressures have brought others into existence. Centers for continuing education are springing up on campuses, and more and more professional schools are providing informal "refresher" work for their graduates. The U.S. Office of Education reports that the number of non-degree credit students—both resident and extension—has gone up more than 33 per cent in recent years, and that there seems to be a gradual shift in the various types of enrollment toward the less regular and less traditional categories.

If the university is growing and getting more complex, so is its "service" function.

TWO: THE UNIVERSITY AND ITS PUBLIC SERVICE FUNCTION

What is a university?

When I began this exploration, this question did not immediately occur to me. My job was to try to find out what the university was doing in continuing education; not what it was. But as I talked with university people, and began trying to square what they said it was with the functions it had assumed (or was assuming), I realized that this was anything but an irrelevant question.

Webster's dictionary defines a university as "an institution of learning of the highest grade, having a college of liberal arts and a program of graduate studies, together with several professional schools and faculties."

A university is an institution with a long history in Western civilization. Samuel Eliot Morison notes that in the middle ages a university meant "an institution of learning recognized as such by the pope or king, where teachers or students or both were united in guilds enjoying a certain privilege or autonomy, where some superior study, such as Law, Medicine, or Theology was taught in addition to the seven arts and philosophy, where a definite curriculum was marked out for each subject, and where, at stated periods, the students were examined and granted degrees."[1]

The university is an old institution, with a tradition which dates back at least 600 years prior to the founding of this country. Reading its history, one gets the impression that from the first it was an embattled institution, originating in a need on the part of seasoned scholars and their students to incorporate for "mutual protection . . . from the extortion of of the townsmen and the other annoyances."[2]

---

[1] Samuel E. Morison, Harvard College in the 17th Century (Harvard University Press, 1935).

[2] Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1929 ed., v. 22, p. 862.

Thus, a tradition was born that a university is a community of scholars: "those who teach, and those who learn, and the work they do."[3] In every society in which it exists it is a center of intellectual activity. Its major purposes have for centuries been the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge. And whatever view one may take about the present role of the university, the "community of scholars" idea is the basic concept. The pursuit of truth, and the dissemination of knowledge: these are still its central goals.

"The men and women who . . . make up a company of scholars," writes Jacob Bronowski, "which has been more lasting than any state . . . do not make any wild claims, they do not cheat, they do not try to persuade at any cost, they appeal neither to prejudice nor authority, they are often frank about their ignorance, their disputes are fairly decorous, they do not confuse what is being argued with race, politics, sex, or age, they listen patiently to the young and to the old who both know everything. These are the general virtues of scholarship."[4]

This community of scholars has never been a particularly peaceful place. Conflict of ideas, inter-disciplinary quarrels, rows over whether or not research is more important than teaching, etc., are forever going on.

The scholar who is primarily interested in research is inclined to be willing to subordinate life to learning: the pursuit of truth as an end in itself. The scholar who is primarily a teacher is willing to subordinate learning to life. The good student rather than the good study is the goal, and he is willing to see learning employed for a great variety of individually determined ends, provided its essential integrity is preserved. Both are united in a respect for, and dedication to, the promotion of intellectual disciplines—the habit of truth, the cultivation of the mind.

Research and Teaching

Down to the present day, this community of scholars, as it is epitomized in most faculty bodies, has fully recognized and accepted but two

---

3. Quoted by Thorstein Veblen in his Higher Learning in America (Sagamore Press, 1957), p. 13.

4. Jacob Bronowski, Science and Human Values (Julian Messner, Inc., 1956), p. 75.

functions: research and teaching. It was inevitable, however, that when universities began to emerge in America—and particularly when publicly supported universities began to emerge—they should be asked to do something immediately useful.

"People prefer that system (of higher education)," wrote an early president of the University of Washington, "which is best adapted to the exigencies of life, and which will best prepare men to master the problems of the times in which they live." And to this testimonial to the value of a utilitarian curriculum for university students, he added this sentence: "In recognizing the public obligation to establish and maintain institutions of higher learning and research there is also the implied right of the citizens who have contributed to the support of such institutions to share in their fruits."

Americans have never had any great understanding of or respect for what may be called "learning for learning's sake." They have wanted the immediately applicable by-products of the scholar's eternal search for truth. They have wanted some service for their money. And so around the turn of the century people began to hear of a third function of the university: public service.

Service: The University's New Function

One of the first references to this new function appears in E. E. Slosson's, Great American Universities, which came out in 1910. "The university of the future will be composed of men who have a genius for discovering truth, men adapted to imparting it to others, and also men successful in showing how it may be applied to the problems of life."[5]

And today, most university administrators and faculty members will tell you that there are three major functions of the university: research, teaching, and service. They will talk with animation and conviction about the relative importance of the first two. But when it comes to discussing "service" they often tend to be perfunctory, hesitant, and a little confused.

The plain truth seems to be that while "public service" has been accepted by the university as a function, it has really never been assimilated. This is reflected in much of the writing about universities. Men like Abraham Flexner and Thorstein Veblen were opposed to it as a totally unworthy function for a university to assume. Flexner feared its acceptance would turn the university into a "service station."[6] Veblen dismissed extension teaching with the withering phrase "edification of the unlearned."[7]

---

[5] Quoted in J. R. Morton, University Extension (University of Alabama Press, 1953), p. 11.

Others have taken the view that the modern university could not isolate itself from the culture. "The justification for a university," wrote Alfred North Whitehead, "is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest for life."[8]

Thirty years ago Abraham Flexner, commenting upon the university's obligations to fulfill society's many demands for service, issued a challenge to the university to exercise responsibility in giving it. ". . . A university should not be a weather vane, responsive to every variation of popular whim. Universities must at all times give society, not what society wants, but what it needs."[9]

Ortega y Gasset has been even more vehement: "The university must intervene, as the university, in current affairs, treating the great issues of the day from its own point of view, cultural, professional, scientific. . . ."[10]

James B. Conant echoes this when he says: "The essential motivating force behind a university's work and research in all times and places when universities have flourished, has been the connection between the scholar's activities and the burning questions of the day."[11]

---

[6] Abraham Flexner, Universities—American, English, German (Oxford University Press, 1930).

[7] Thorstein Veblen, op. cit.

[8] Alfred North Whitehead, The Aims of Education and Other Essays (The New American Library, Mentor book edition, 1949), p. 97.

[9] Flexner, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

[10] José Ortega y Gasset, The Mission of the University (Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1946), p. 77.

[11] Quoted by Paul F. Douglass in "Conant's Concept of University Administration," Journal of Higher Education, v. 25 (February, 1954), pp. 59-64.

What Is Service?

"What is service?" asks Frank Pinner, Director, Bureau of Social and Political Research, Michigan State University. "We could define it as making the required response to consumer demands. Under this definition we will have no difficulty in ascertaining whether or not we have been of service: we need only compare the contents of our demands and our actions. . . . The physician is expected to restore and maintain our health, the garage mechanic to keep our car in running condition."

But these criteria, he argues, do not apply to the pursuit of knowledge. People seldom consider new discoveries in any area a service. Therefore an enterprise which sets out to be of "service" to people cannot be involved in "creative innovation." Pinner points out that universities tend—in their extramural activities—to offer routine advice and help to people, "often giving them what we (the faculty) consider worthless, and keeping for our private entertainment what we consider worthwhile."[12]

What Types of Services?

"That the university is obligated to serve the community," said Arthur Kornhauser, professor of psychology, Wayne State University, in a recent address, "there can be no doubt." But what community and by what types of services?

"The community may be conceived as strictly local, nation-wide or world-wide; it may be confined to present day youth and adults now looking to the university for educational services, or it may include all mankind, stretching endlessly (we may hope) into the future. Even more variable are the views as to which services the university is properly to supply.

"The question confronts the typical university with a traumatic choice: whether to give the politically expedient answer or take a stand on fundamental principle. . . . The temptation of the times is to be public relations minded, opportunistic, conformist."

What should be done?

---

[12] Frank Pinner, "The Future of the University," unpublished manuscript, to appear in considerably revised form as chapter in Higher Education in the Social Sciences, edited by Nevitt Sanford.

Both obviously dislike the term "service" when applied to education. "I would argue," says Kornhauser, "that the university's primary responsibility is to advance understanding, to help people (intellectual elites, grass roots leaders, and people generally) to find answers to life's deeper meanings through intellectual analysis and persistent independent study, and to grow and enjoy the quest itself even though the answers repetitiously prove only steps to further questions."[13]

Pinner, as we've seen, apparently dislikes the service idea because he feels it is "talking down" to people, "giving them what we don't value." "Education," he suggests, "involves imparting to groups in the community a sense of participation in the search for knowledge, by introducing them, as best we can, to our real concern as scholars," even, he adds, to the extent of inviting "men and women in many walks of life to associate themselves with us in our research."[14]

I have quoted at some length from scholars to show that, although the university as it is epitomized in the "community of scholars" has not yet assimilated its "service" function, it is giving it more and more attention.

What Kornhauser, Pinner, and the older scholars—Ortega y Gasset, Newman, and Conant—all seem to be saying is this: while no modern university can remain apart from the community, it can serve it successfully only if the "community of scholars" is also to maintain its own integrity, serve on its own terms, maintain its own standards—"share with all who care to join with us, our real concerns as scholars"—but be sure they are our concerns! Intervene in current affairs; treat the great issues of the day—but as the university!

It seems to me these views reflect acceptance of a university "service" function not as a new function of the university, but as, literally, an extension of the traditional functions of research and teaching. This is acceptance of the "service" function in terms that promise the assimilation of "service" to the ends of teaching and research. To many people outside the "community of scholars," this approach to the university's service function is beginning to make sense.

---

[13] Arthur Kornhauser, "The University and the Community in Our Times," in Graduate Comment, published by Wayne State University, v. II, no. 5, pp. 2-9.

[14] Pinner, op. cit.

But it made no sense at the beginning, fifty years ago, when the university extension movement was getting under way. One of the reasons many extension ventures in the late 1890's and early 1900's went sour probably lay in the fact that faculty members did try this approach, invited the public to share their concerns. But the public had only a slight interest in the things that concerned the professor. People wanted help on the things that concerned them.

Many date the real beginning of the modern university extension movement in America around 1910, when the University of Wisconsin began to put the "Wisconsin Idea" into practice.

Extension's Concept of Service

"Always remember," wrote Louis Reber, the first director of the University's Extension Division, in an early memo to his staff, "that while you are employed by the University Extension Division, you are really working for those people of the state with whom your duties bring you in contact. Your success is to be measured by what good you do for them."

Here in a nutshell is the philosophy behind the "service concept" of university extension, a concept which has dominated the movement for the last fifty years. (It has also, I might add, been the working hypothesis upon which the agricultural extension service built the most impressive "adult education" operation in the history of this country.)

What Reber did, in effect, was to create a "high level social service" agency within the University. It had very little to do with the university as a "community of scholars"; it had its own faculty. For most of its life —unless I can't read history—Wisconsin's University Extension Division was an active and effective semi-autonomous social and vocational education agency associated with the University of Wisconsin, hiring its own staff, developing its own program (chiefly self-supported), largely determining its own goals.

Its success was based on strict observance of the principle that the felt needs and interests of the people were paramount. This notion has always irritated the scholars, not only at Wisconsin, but elsewhere.

University Extension

Earlier we quoted E. E. Slosson's prophecy that "the university of the future" would add another function (service) to its roster of purposes. Slosson was compelled to add, however: "It must not be supposed that this third function has often been adopted by universities because it completes their educational effectiveness. On the contrary, it has usually been forced upon them by the outside world, and many universities yet pride themselves on the degree to which they have resisted that pressure and maintained the old-fashioned college with all its so-called purity. The utilitarian functions are generally added for the most utilitarian of motives: because they bring money to the support of the university."[15]

"The extramural activities of our modern universities have been imposed upon the faculties without their consent or, at least, without their desire," writes James Creese. "Extension was not adopted by a vote of the faculty at the University of Wisconsin; it was adopted by a vote of the Wisconsin Legislature. Extension was not formally approved by an established faculty at the University of Wisconsin; it was made part of the University plan by a new president of a new university who had not yet selected his faculty."[16]

Two Views on "Service"

What emerges from all this is that we have two quite different views of the nature of "public service" existing side by side in the university. One regards it as a mandate to find ways of "sharing" the university's intellectual concerns and interests with all people who are able and willing to give it the necessary time and attention. The other holds it to be the responsibility of the university to seek to uncover the immediate needs and interests of people, and to devise ways and means of helping them to meet them.

So far the second approach—espoused by nearly all professional extension people—has been dominant. But it has been dominant at the cost of some estrangement of extension from the faculty—which is to say, the university proper.

---

[15] Quoted in J. R. Morton, op. cit.

[16] James Creese, The Extension of University Teaching (American Association of Adult Education, 1941), p. 154.

Three Basic Ideas

The main argument for the presence of university extension in the university hinges on three ideas: (1) that a university should make available extension education opportunities for a formal college education—or its equivalent—to young people and others who are unable to become regular full-time students; (2) that it has an obligation to provide educational services to the wider community that supports it; (3) that it should provide opportunities for continuing education for those who have absorbed as much formal education as they desire, but who wish to continue learning.

These ideas emerged from a society that placed the test of immediate usefulness on all of its social institutions. (Education of the young was at best a deferred investment; practical informational and education service made available to adults who supported the institution was of value now.) They grew out of convictions—held by laymen and many educators—that opportunities should be extended to everyone qualified to take advantage of them. Higher education—in a word—should not be allowed to become the special province of an elite, nor should higher learning become an end in itself but should, wherever possible, be put to the service of the immediate educational needs of the people.

Service—the development of the capacity to respond to people's expressed interests and needs—came to be regarded as the keystone in the arch that most university extension divisions built between the university and the community.

We will comment briefly on the three types of activity as described above:

Extension Education. From the outset, the university's extension education program (credit courses given in the evenings, off-campus or by correspondence) has been its largest—and often most lucrative—"service" activity. Demand for extension classes at Illinois was ahead of the University's capacity to supply teachers, and in all universities I visited there were substantial increases in enrollment. An interesting development in some universities—which we will comment on later in this report—is a tendency to remove credit-bearing extension classes from the Extension or Public Service Division and place them directly under academic control. This has been accompanied by an attempt to assign full-time faculty members to these classes as part of their normal academic load.

Educational Services. Nothing is more baffling to the outsider than to try to discover some meaningful rationale for the varied educational service activities undertaken in universities—particularly those publicly supported. A good many of these activities—although by no means all—have been made the responsibility of university extension, thus further contributing to the ambiguity of its function. In fact, some extension divisions have the appearance of having been turned into a kind of "grab bag" of miscellaneous, unrelated "service" operations of one kind or another. Thus, the Extension Division at the University of Illinois operates among other things a Speech Aids Service, a Vocational Counseling Service, a Firemanship Training Program, an Audio-Visual Aids Service, a Police Training Institute.

New York University's Division of General Education not only conducts an extensive non-credit class program, but is responsible for an Office of Special Services for Business and Industry, a Reading Institute, a Safety Education Center, a Tax Institute, and a Testing and Advisement Center. A similar list could be drawn up for many other universities.

All of these services are undoubtedly of considerable importance to some segment—or segments—of the adult populations in the areas in which these universities exist. Many of these services are entirely self-supporting. They are put into universities for a variety of reasons. Most of them have only a tangential relationship to what is presumably the institution's central reason for being. Sometimes they are installed as a result of pressure from special interest groups, or influential governmental units. Local industries may want special training programs. Pressure from organized labor may bring in an Institute for Labor Relations.

Another kind of "educational service" which is assuming prominence in many universities is that being rendered to government agencies and some foundations. On every campus, thoughtful faculty members express concern over the effects of foundation grants and federal contracts on university policy. For in many instances these represented, in one way or another, the purchase of "services" from the universities. Whether this is a "good" thing or a "bad" thing depends entirely upon how a university regards its central functions, and how good a grip it has on its own integrity. In all fairness, perhaps a distinction should be made between foundation grants and government contracts. In the case of the latter, the agency's needs are the primary consideration, whereas in the case of foundation grants the university usually has to initiate the request. Whether it is a "service" to the university or to the foundation depends on whether the initiative is real or "induced."

Work with other organizations has become popular with university extension divisions. Many are finding themselves increasingly committed to the idea that they can most effectively, efficiently, and economically fulfill their educational functions through service to already organized groups. These may be industries, businesses, associations of various kinds, or governmental units.

The arguments for this kind of service are very persuasive. A great many more people can be "reached" by the university, if the university can get access to already organized memberships. Such groups are usually both willing and able to pay the full cost of the service. By assisting in the formulation of educational programs put on by these organizations, the university can have a far greater influence on people than it could if the groups had to be brought together on an ad hoc basis. The cost of promotion is reduced, since organized groups can be counted on to handle recruitment. The university is serving society more effectively if it assists in the improvement of society's voluntary groups, than if it developed its own groups.

As a result of reasoning along these lines, many universities have greatly increased activity in what has come to be called the "short course and conference" programming idea. The notion of "service" is usually the dominant, operative principle behind the beginning of most short course and conference programs, as well as the training and vocational-improvement offerings and "work with other organizations" that bulk large today in most extension divisions.

Thus, the University of Illinois Extension Division's self-supporting program in this area, conducted at its residential facility at Allerton House, has to be considered largely a "service" program. Requests come from organizations, agencies, industries that wish to put on a program of some kind. Extension staff members—and often university faculty people —help shape the program content, assist in conducting it, and thus presumably enhance its educational effectiveness.

With the increase of university-affiliated "continuing education centers," there has been an increased sensitivity on the part of extension staff members to the non-educational implications of the term "service." Michigan State University's Kellogg Center for Continuing Education had for a time a dubious reputation in university circles as a glorified hotel operation. Anxious to keep the costly facilities in use as much of the time as possible ("It costs a million dollars to open the front door every year"), it made them available for organized group and association meetings and conferences of all kinds. This policy was soon changed. Now all applicants are screened. According to the Center director, the University—in the persons of appropriate representatives from its subject matter departments and Center staff—participates in the planning and conduct of all conferences, meetings, or short courses held in the Center's facilities.

But despite these precautions, the question of how much and what kind of "service" activity a university is justified in taking on is getting increased attention on all campuses today, as more and more pressure is placed on both the facilities and the faculty resources.

Educational service can be an effective means for the university to influence the community at large, by improving the quality and content of programming done by a great variety of organizations and associations. But "services" can also further dilute the life and purposes of the universities. They can fritter away faculty time on ephemeral assignments: further contributions to the "edification of the unlearned."

"Who is influencing whom—and to what end?" is the central question in all the service-oriented operations of the university.

Most of these service activities are related to training of one kind or another. While training and education are so intertwined in our culture as to make any attempt clearly to distinguish between them almost impossible, there was concern in every extension division I visited over too much "vocationalism."

"Education," Abraham Flexner once wrote, "is an intellectual and spiritual process. It has to do with opening the windows of the human mind and human soul. It involves the effort to understand, to comprehend, to be sensitive to ideas, aspirations and interests to which the individual might otherwise be indifferent. Training connotes improved ability to do something, without deepened understanding, widened sympathy, or heightened aspirations. . . . Training concerns itself with tools and devices while education concerns itself with something that has intellectual or spiritual content and motive. Training is a means; education is an end."[17]

Every director of a university "conferences and short courses" operation or a continuing education center I talked to in my journeys was acutely aware of this problem and troubled by its implications. "It's a constant test of both your ingenuity and your integrity," said one. "On the one hand, I've got to make this operation pay for itself; the budget is always breathing down my neck. I know that a lot of the organizations want to book the facilities just because it's cheaper than a hotel. Or they like the notion of the university affiliation. They want the program to at least seem educational. Then, after I've struggled to get them to put what I think is some real educational content into the program, I wonder how much good it did—and who's kidding whom. But sometimes it does take hold, and the group comes back another year and asks me to do what I had to sell them on doing."

It would appear that training and education are certainly anything but incompatible, but he who wants to make them work in tandem for clearly conceived university goals has to know precisely what he is doing, and be forever on the alert. "In a world in which more and more people are looking for meaning as well as training," said one professor, "and in a society which must look more and more to the university for intellectual guidance, the 'service concept' of the university takes on a new dimension."

Continuing Education. Continuing education is a phrase that has suddenly become very popular. It is being used so widely and so loosely as to be in danger—like the phrase "adult education"—of losing all real meaning.

At the present time I take it to mean all those educational activities designed for adults who are through with formal schooling, but wish to take further serious class or course work, especially designed for adults, which will help them improve professionally or keep alive intellectually.

---

[17] Abraham Flexner, "The Gates of Excellence," in Journal of Adult Education, v. IV, no. 1 (January, 1932), pp. 5-7.

The work should be of some duration, should require a commitment to study and active participation in learning. The New York University Division of General Education's non-credit classes may be considered prime examples. Others are the Basic Program in liberal arts at the University of Chicago, the Brooklyn College experimental degree program, the study-discussion, lecture-discussion groups and the "Liberal Arts for Labor" program at California, the "living room learning" study-discussion programs at UCLA, NYU, University of Utah, and other places.

"Continuing education" is apparently being counted on by many directors to give university extension a shot in the arm. Some universities—University of Washington is an example—have quietly dropped the term "university extension division."[18] The change has much to recommend it. If universities are going to reorganize themselves to meet a now-recognized need, or in response to the development of a new philosophy of "service," a new name will be helpful.

---

[18] At Columbia University 15 years ago, when the School for General Studies was established, Director Harry Ayers came to the conclusion that "the all too unsavory name of University Extension is no longer applicable. It emphasizes both within and without the University that what it denominates is not quite a legitimate child of Alma Mater. It has been so far a Cinderella without even the hope of a fairy godmother. I am convinced that the moment has arrived for public affirmation of the fact that University Extension is indeed a part of the University and in its field of adult education, which is of growing importance, indispensable and as good as the full support of the University can make it." (J. A. Burrell, *History of Adult Education at Columbia University* [Columbia University Press, 1954], p. 96.)

THREE: ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

All the universities I visited were either in the process of some kind of reorganization or contemplating it. Some of the decisions made (or not made, which is the usual way) are going to have a considerable effect on future development of the university's "service" function. Here I want to outline and discuss five issues affecting the way a university organizes itself to discharge its "extension service" responsibilities.

1. Are the extension service activities to be viewed as integral or peripheral functions of the university?

2. Are they to be handled in a predominantly decentralized fashion (i.e., college by college, department by department) or centralized through a single university extension division?

3. Is chief stress to be laid on credit or non-credit activities?

4. Who shall teach? Should a separate "extension faculty" be assembled? Should teachers be recruited on a part-time "overload" pay basis? Or procured from outside the university? Or should regular faculty spend part of their normal load in extension teaching?

5. To what extent—if any—should a university's extension service activities be self-supporting?

1. Peripheral or Integral Function?

When in 1912 the University of California first petitioned the state legislature for funds to support a university extension service, the request was included in a separate bill. It was not included as part of the regular University budget request, said President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, because it was a "special and peculiar" operation.

Thus, at the very beginning of what has since become the world's largest extension division operation, the label "peripheral" was firmly affixed. Later, provision for extension was made in the over-all University budget, but there is little question that in the minds of faculty and administration the connotation "special and peculiar" remained.

Even at the University of Wisconsin, which perhaps has come as close as any state university to making extension an "integral" part of its over-all operation, it was possible—years after Van Hise's day—for a president to write to a regent that extension was "definitely an academic sideline . . . any man who entered it and stayed in was bound to forfeit academic promotion."[1]

Before going further, let us define our terms. Any extension or continuing education operation may be considered an "integral" part of a university's work, (1) if its content is "university level" (i.e., on a par with "regular" university work; (2) if it is conducted primarily by full-time faculty members as a regular part of their assigned academic duties; or (3) if, in determining an individual faculty member's qualifications for advancement or salary increase, the same consideration is given for work in extension or continuing education as for "regular" teaching or research activities.[2]

On the other hand, an operation may be considered "peripheral" (1) if it does not deal with "university level" content; (2) if it is handled as an extra assignment by a faculty member, with or without extra compensation; or (3) if responsibility for it is not regarded as affecting—in one way or another—the faculty member's fiscal or professional advancement.

These terms are by no means absolutes. There is no university in which all extension services can be regarded as an integral part of the university, any more than there is one where they can be regarded as completely peripheral. I believe, however, that the terms are useful in placing the activity's status in the university; they may be viewed as the extreme ends of a continuum.

The terms are not intended to carry any invidious connotation. An extension or continuing education program which has met all the conditions required here for "integration" could still be a program of wretched quality, if faculty members assigned to it were indifferent to its demands and the administration was apathetic. A "peripheral" program, on the other hand, could be excellent with top-quality teachers and imaginative programming.

---

[1] While this is not generally true at Wisconsin today, the attitude still prevails in many departments.

[2] Some universities today do attempt to give some consideration to "university relations" and "community relations" in reviewing qualifications for advancement or pay increases, but few, if any, would be prepared to say that it is the same consideration.

The terms take on special significance if we accept the definition of a university as a "community of scholars." Those activities which a majority of faculty members agree are important and which the administration enables them to carry on as a part of their regular work, can be readily identified as integral. Those which they regard as of secondary importance and which have to be carried on outside the regular assignment of responsibility are peripheral.

One explanation of the controversy in academic circles that has attended the sponsorship of credit classes through extension is the simple fact that they are by definition neither integral nor peripheral to the university. The faculty is responsible for the content of a given course and approval of its instructor. It is responsible, but not involved—as a faculty—since even if its members teach in extension, they do not usually do so as part of their regular duties.

The present "crisis" in extension is, therefore, to be viewed as one aspect of a long overdue reappraisal and sorting out of the multifarious activities that universities now find themselves engaged in. In this process they are having to make arbitrary decisions as to which of these are to be integral, and which peripheral, and to assign priorities for the allocation of men and money.

Let me repeat. In attempting to distinguish those activities which are integral to a university—considered as a community of scholars—and those which are peripheral, I do not think that the latter should necessarily be considered secondary functions of the university as a university. Maintenance of a university bookstore is, if you will, a "peripheral" activity of a university, although the usual term here is "auxiliary"; it is not, however, a secondary function. It is a different kind of function.

To put it another way, New York University's Division of General Education has the status of an independent "college" within the "family" of colleges that make up the University. But it does not offer credit courses; its "faculty" is ninety per cent non-university faculty. They are highly competent, professionally qualified, and the courses offered are of college level, designed to fit the needs of adults. In accepting responsibility for sponsoring the self-supporting Division, New York University implicitly enlarges its function to include the provision of educational opportunities for adults outside its formal educational framework. It accepts the Division as an integral part of the University. But insofar as the New York University "community of scholars" is concerned, it seems to be clearly and definitely a "peripheral" operation.

Faculty members from Harvard University teach classes formed by the Commission for Extension Courses, through which courses paralleling those taught on the Harvard campus are offered. Harvard itself gives a special degree—Adjunct in the Arts—to those who successfully complete the required semester hours. But the Commission's program operates outside the Harvard academic structure; professors teach in the program (for a fee) in addition to their regular assignments.[3] The program's content and standards are determined by Harvard. Therefore, in spirit at least, it is "integral" to Harvard tradition, but as a semi-autonomous venture it is completely peripheral to Harvard.[4]

The General Extension Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education has been established as a unit coordinate with the universities and colleges in that System. Yet a great majority of the faculty members who teach the courses offered do so as an extra assignment, on the basis of a modest "overload" pay. Under our definition, therefore, extension activities are largely a peripheral activity of the System.

On the other hand, Michigan State University's Center for Continuing Education has a large enough budget to provide "subsidies" to various cooperating departments and schools, enabling them to assign full-time teachers to handle extension and continuing education activities. This does not necessarily indicate that at MSU extension is an "integral" activity, since under this plan the Center is in effect "buying" service from the various departments. The initiative here still rests—it would appear—outside the community of scholars. However, MSU may be considered to be moving in the direction of ultimate integration.

---

[3] Incidentally, this is one of the few "outside" activities in which Harvard faculty are permitted to engage on a fee basis.

[4] In the fall of 1960 (after this report was prepared) Harvard inaugurated a Bachelor of Arts in Extension Studies degree to replace the Adjunct in the Arts degree.

At Northeastern University a new unit, called University College, has been established, with its own faculty, which will not only conduct informal educational activities for adults, but offer a special credit program for which a special adult degree will be offered. Does this constitute a full integration of the continuing education into the University, or is it a form of "segregation," a kind of "separate but equal" arrangement, in which the function is accepted but set apart from the "regular" operation?

Columbia University's School of General Studies is officially committed to providing a "college education for adults." In the process it has moved away from the notion of providing education "suitable" to the needs and interests of adults, toward admitting adults who are "suitable" for an academic college education. Students must present adequate credentials or submit to rigorous examination, and usually matriculate for a degree the standards for which are equivalent to the standards used in other colleges in the University. What Columbia seems to be saying is that it recognizes the need of adults for the equivalent of a college education, and the equivalent ought to be given in a situation as closely approximating the "regular" college situation as possible.

The University of Chicago's University College, like many extension divisions, has the appearance of being a quasi-integral part of the institution. Most university faculty are employed by the College on an "overload" basis, but some of the University's schools still supply teachers on a "regular assignment" basis. For example, the School of Education faculty members teach University College classes without extra compensation. Courses offered at University College are put on as a "service" to the Chicago community.

Boston University seems to be moving to make continuing education an integral part of its operation. A Division of Continuing Education is contemplated which will be geared in closely with the various departments, and in which some full-time faculty members will be involved in teaching adults as part of their regular assignments.

Although the president of Tufts University seems committed to the principle that continuing education should be made an integral part of the University, and considers competence and willingness to teach adults an important quality to be sought in new faculty members, this is still a peripheral function as performed by faculty through the institution's College of Special Studies.

Recent developments at the University of Michigan provide interesting food for speculation. Was the decision to join with Wayne State University in setting up a Division for Adult Education in the Detroit area a purely local experiment, or the first step toward the establishment of a semi-independent, jointly sponsored, state-wide operation through which all non-credit continuing education activities might be handled? If so, then Michigan would seem to be moving toward making its continuing education activities a peripheral function. But it is much too early to tell.

Under a new administration at the University of Washington, extension credit classes have been removed from the Division of Continuing Education, and there is a strong possibility that they will be integrated into the university structure by assigning faculty to teach either day or evening classes on a regular salary basis, in a plan similar to that now used at Wayne State University. The Division, which will have to be largely self-supporting and employ instructors on an "overload" basis, must therefore be considered a peripheral activity. The University's completely subsidized Community Development program is at present wholly peripheral to the University operation, but there is some talk of using it as the base for the development of what might become an "urban extension service," with the program staff tied in to campus departments through joint appointments.

At the University of Illinois, a somewhat confused situation exists—at least from the viewpoint of arbitrary classification. The Extension Division's operation, although fairly well subsidized, has to be considered peripheral because instructors are all engaged on an extra-pay basis. However, the extension activities of many of the other campus units must be looked at as integral, since full-time regular staff are involved in many of them, and the activities themselves are a recognized part of the college or department's program.

2. Centralization Versus Decentralization

When we talk about "centralization" versus "decentralization" we are really talking about where the initiative for formation and development of classes and activities comes from. Does it come from a central office or division in the university, or from the individual departments?

Or is it a mixed situation, with provision for initiative from both directions? Here, as with the distinction between peripheral and integral, the situation is blurred in most institutions. The practice followed usually parallels the way the university itself "grew up" and is currently organized.

Most of the older, larger universities with a "community of scholars" tradition have evolved decentralized modes of operation. At Columbia University, the departments are the real centers of power. At New York University the cluster of schools and colleges which make up the whole possess a high degree of independence. According to the statutes of the University of Illinois, departments are given as much autonomy of operation as is consistent with the interest of the school or college in which they are located; schools and colleges are given as much autonomy as is consistent with the over-all purposes of the university.

In such situations, unless rigid central administration policies forbid it, separate schools and colleges tend to develop their own extension service operations. While New York University's Division of General Education added the phrase "and Extension" to its title a few years ago, and the central administration requested all units of the University to channel their non-credit activities through the Division, much of this work is still done directly by the schools and colleges.[5] Institutional habits are stronger than institutional directives.

At Michigan State University, which as a former state agricultural college did not develop a strong community of scholars tradition, and which has been operated under a highly centralized administration for fifteen years, it has been possible successfully to institute a centralized extension and continuing education operation. If this pattern is able to persist over a period of time, the habit of centralization will probably take hold.

At the University of Illinois a mixed situation exists, with the bulk of the University's extension activities being handled through a University Extension Division, but with a half dozen other units—including the

---

[5] The Division's role as a coordinating agency is complicated by the fact that it is, to all intents, another "school" within the University family.

College of Education, College of Business Administration, the School of Education, the College of Fine and Applied Arts, etc.—handling their off-campus service and continuing education activities unilaterally.

The arguments for departmental (or decentralized) extension are simple. As more and more of the university's units do field work of one kind or another—consultations, research studies, surveys, etc.—they are brought into contact with those segments of the public most interested in their subject field. Suggestions for conferences, short courses, and other informal continuing education activities flow naturally from this relationship, and therefore it is logical for the college or school to follow through and put them on. Proponents of this approach look upon the extension staff (if they look upon them at all) essentially as educational "technicians" useful in helping to plan a conference format, publicizing it, arranging for meeting places, necessary equipment, sending out notices, etc. Initiative in planning such events, and control in handling them, should, however, be vested in the sponsoring school or college.

Advocates of the centralized—unified—extension operation point out: that a policy of decentralization of off-campus operations tends to fragment the university; that it is costly insofar as some duplication of administration is necessary; that it tends to put the different units in competition with each other for public attention, encourages "empire building" etc. But the major argument for centralization is that educational offerings should be designed to fit the needs and interests of the adults served and not slanted to the needs and interest of particular schools or colleges. The extension officer should not be a "technician" but an educator—with a clear knowledge of the resources of the university and some knowledge of the needs and interests of the community. He is in a position to act creatively in bringing together faculty from different disciplines in the construction and conduct of given activities.

Where a state-wide university extension service embraces several "independent" campuses—as is the case in California and Oregon—centralization can, however, have an inhibiting effect upon the smaller universities and colleges. Attention tends to be concentrated on the "headquarters" campuses, and more programming help tends to be given the larger population areas. There also seems to be a tendency to play down local initiative and to ignore unique institutional differences.

3. Credit Versus Non-Credit Activities

Many university faculty members have convinced themselves that only those courses which can be and are being offered for credit can be called "education" in any meaningful sense of that term.

The argument runs like this: Credit courses are planned, and are given (presumably) under the direction of a competent accredited faculty member. A course on "Principles of Economics," for example, treats a subject matter area that the University has officially approved as being worth the time, effort, and money of those who choose to give it attention. And—again presumably—it is given in a manner best calculated to increase the individual's knowledge of the subject. Students who enter the class for credit are required in advance of taking the course to prove that they are qualified to benefit from it (matriculation). They are tested and graded at the completion of the course. Each course is a part of a complex of courses (a curriculum) designed to give the student a minimal acquaintance in—and presumably some mastery of—a specific field of knowledge (i.e., economics, veterinary medicine, journalism, etc.).

The argument continues: Non-credit courses, on the other hand, require no qualification beyond interest. They frequently do not make the same demands upon the student, either in length of course or required preparation. No measurement is demanded aside from that devised by the student and imposed on himself. Furthermore, most non-credit courses are prepared either in response to, or in anticipation of, immediate interest on the part of the participant.[6] Therefore, many formal educators contend, their quality as true education is somewhat suspect. This has always been vigorously denied by the adult educator, who counter-attacks with the argument that only courses which the adult student helps develop that are fitted to his immediate needs and interests, and that are taken for their own sake and not for credit, are truly "educational."

The crucial issues here, it seems to me, are those of control and responsibility. In the credit course, the institution—represented by the teacher—is firmly in control of the situation, and the latter is responsible for what happens. In the non-credit adult course, both control and responsibility are necessarily shared with the students.

---

[6] The quality and range of these courses as offered through universities seemed to be increasing. There is considerable evidence—particularly in those university extension services which with Fund for Adult Education assistance have undertaken experiments in liberal adult education—that given an opportunity, adults will support non-credit courses of considerable substance.

It is the off-campus and evening credit courses, given for part-time students, which have always given the academic faculty member the most concern. A great majority of university faculty members have never been willing to believe that work done by part-time students in classes given through extension could be considered the equivalent of work done on campus by full-time students.[7]

"A college education," remarked a dean of a college of letters and sciences in the far west, "is a series of learning experiences in residence in an educational institution. It's a full-time job. I have great sympathy for, say, the girl who goes to college a year, gets married, has kids, then thinks she wants to get a degree by correspondence or going to night school. Under some present plans she can. But I don't think she or we should be fooled into thinking that she is getting an equivalent education wrapped up in the degree she receives. What she should face—and what we should face—is that in life you can't have it both ways. A college education demands hard work and sacrifice. You can't piece it together at odd hours." Not many faculty members would be as forthright in stating this view, but it is probably widely shared.

Opponents deride this as the "campus mystique" approach to residence education; they say it is compounded chiefly of nostalgia and romanticism. They point out that objective testing of on-campus and off-campus students shows no fundamental difference in learning achieved. Both the best and worst students are found in extension credit classes.

A case could be made for the view that college credit systems have become in effect little "monetary" systems in themselves. Rates of exchange among institutions vary, depending on the reputations, the academic requirements, the length of the learning periods (semesters, quarters). Concern over "credit devaluation" is as much a factor in academic misgivings over extension as concern over the quality of education.

---

[7] Yet it must be pointed out that these same faculty members often permit graduate students to string out courses over seven or eight years.

And in all fairness, the two are not unrelated. "We don't want to get into the trading stamp business," said one dean. "You know: let a student pick up a few stamps in this extension division, a few in that one, and when he gets the required number, let him paste them in a book and turn it in for a degree! " All universities I visited put a limit on the number of extension credits allowable toward a degree, and require so many semester or quarter hours in residence.

When William Rainey Harper started the University of Chicago, he initially allowed up to fifty per cent of the credits toward a degree to be earned through extension. But his faculty lost little time in cutting it back to a third. Although I have seen no study of this, the percentage allowable seems to bear some relation to supply and demand of residential students, and is an arbitrary figure at best.

Extension credit courses are still the mainstay of most of the "extension divisions" of the universities visited. This would seem to indicate that apart from demand for purely vocational classes most adults still want regular college credit in their pursuit of higher education.

The credit versus non-credit controversy tends to be further confused by the fact that all concerned seem to forget the original purpose for establishing the credit system. Back of it lies the "curriculum," the collection of courses or "learning experiences" a student should have, to "cover" a given subject matter area. Establishment of the credit system—theoretically, at any rate—enables the institution to set up the kinds of educational experiences it feels will best enable a student to gain entry into—or further explore—any given field of learning. You might say that this is the way it gives evidence that it takes responsibility for education.

Most adults, of course, take credit courses because they want a degree of some kind, not only for such status as a degree confers, but also because possession of a degree enhances job openings and advancement in more and more fields today. Many adults seek credit courses on the theory that this is the only way they can be sure courses given are of university level. If the university is willing to give credit for them, they must be good! Credit courses are also often preferred by those who want to make intellectual demands on themselves—and to have demands made on them. Credit courses require some form of examination. There is an outside evaluation of what the individual has done.

The central question here, it seems to me, is whether the university will, in the future, devise a set of curricula—for which it will give credit toward degrees in various fields—that is capable of almost infinite extension outward, or whether it will raise standards in such a way as to effect a drastic limitation in part-time learning situations.

Those arguing for the latter course contend that, no matter what the so-called objective tests reveal, the learning situation in which the average extension student finds himself is inevitably inferior to that of the "regular" student. A three-unit, "on-campus" course, it is pointed out, is usually broken up into three one-hour sessions—say, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Is a three-unit extension course, covering the same material, for the same credit, but given during three consecutive hours one evening a week, actually, they ask, an equivalent course? Furthermore, the student doesn't as a rule have access to a good library. Or if he has access, he may not have time to do anything beyond the minimum reading required. Therefore, it is argued, the university should not further dilute the quality of the education upon which it places its seal by increasing the amount of part-time extension work permitted.

Those favoring further extension argue that the university is moving in this direction whether it wants to or not. More and more of the campus-based students—undergraduate, graduate, and professional—are part-time students. "Most of the schools which make up New York University are really 'adult education enterprises,'" a professor of that University remarked. "A majority of the students are adults working for their degrees on a part-time basis." One argument for credit courses is that it gives the university the initiative and the control of the course of study. If the teachers' attitudes and the methods used are suited to adults as well as young people, would there be anything wrong with an expanded university credit program?

There is, of course, a third way to handle the problem of credit for the adult part-time student. This is to follow the Harvard lead and establish a special credit-and-degree program for adults. The proliferation of special "certification" programs of one kind or another for vocational and professional advancement would seem to be a step in this direction. London University in England has long offered an extra-mural degree which is parallel in every way to the campus degree.

Northeastern University's new University College will "offer curricula expressly to meet the needs of employed people who wish to undertake during evening hours programs leading to certificates, associate degrees, or bachelor of science degrees with specification as to field of concentration." New York University's Division of General Education has for some time been examining the possibility of offering a special two-year Associate in the Arts degree for adults.

While there is some evidence that demand for credit and non-credit classes is increasing at about the same rate in most universities, there appears to be a very definite move on foot in all universities to mark off one activity more clearly from the other. Thus, the University of Michigan is divesting itself of its informal educational activities in the Detroit area and turning them over to the new University of Michigan-Wayne State University Division of Adult Education. The action of Wayne State University in throwing out non-matriculated students in its late afternoon and evening classes occurred at about the same time that Columbia was doing the same thing in its School of General Studies. One of the precipitating factors in Northeastern's establishment of a University College was a desire to equalize the credit system within the institution. The University's night credit program is larger than its day-time program, and up until recently the former included a great many older "students" who were taking work for self-improvement and vocational advancement. Mixture of these with younger students working for degrees was frowned upon by academic accrediting agencies, and so the change was made in part to upgrade the institution's academic status.

At the University of Washington the Evening College credit work has been taken out of the Division of Continuing Education and put under the Provost in charge of academic work. A move is on foot to put the quality of teaching in the Evening Division on a par with that done in the day classes, by having both taught by full-time faculty as part of their regular assignments.

4. Who Shall Teach?

There are five different ways in which a university may make instructors available for extension, continuing education, and "service" activities: (1) Appointment of full-time separate faculty to the extension operation; (2) Assignment of "campus" faculty to teaching in extension as a part of their regular duties; (3) Employment of regular faculty members in extension on an "over-load" basis for which additional compensation is given; (4) Employment of part-time non-faculty teachers, whose qualifications to teach are subject to review and approval by appropriate university departments; and (5) Employment for informal classes of "outside" teachers whose only qualifications are demonstrated mastery of a given subject and capacity to teach it to adults, and who are not subject to faculty review.

A Full-Time Extension Faculty. The two institutions generally credited with giving the greatest impetus to the modern university extension movement—the University of Wisconsin and the University of Chicago—both started out with the notion that extension needed its own full-time "faculty." Reber (of the University of Wisconsin) is said to have conceived the function of extension to be largely outside the area of the conventional university scheme, its main purpose being to offer utilitarian courses at virtually any level. Such a program, Reber argued, needed a special staff, since "regular" faculty members were not qualified either by training or inclination to work informally with adults. He tried to develop a "separate but equal" faculty for the extension division along these lines. When the present extension director came to office fifteen years ago, he began slowly but successfully to work toward an integration of the two faculties.

When William Rainey Harper established university extension as a major division of his newly formed University of Chicago, he, too, envisaged the work of the new unit being handled by its own full-time faculty. The early members of the Lecture Study Department gave one hundred per cent of their time to the new venture. But, with the founding of University College around 1900, it became obvious that the activity was not only going to have to be self-supporting, but would depend chiefly on part-time help from the regular faculty.

Today—outside the agricultural extension service in land grant colleges—no university attempts to maintain a full-time separate faculty for its extension operation.

A number of the universities included in this sample have either established the practice, or are moving toward the establishment of the practice, of assigning regular faculty members to some extension teaching as a part of their regularly assigned duties.[8] Thus, the activities of the Center of Continuing Education at Michigan State University are for the most part manned by regular faculty on this basis. At Wayne State University the decision to make no distinction between evening college and day college credit classes is in effect a decision to assign regular faculty to extension work. And, as we have noted, the University of Washington is moving toward some such arrangement on its own campus. At the University of Chicago, at least two colleges—Education and Business Administration—have for some time assigned faculty members to teach in extension or at University College as part of their regular load.

The School of General Studies at Columbia, as was mentioned earlier, is moving to complete integration with the University. It has eliminated the non-matriculated student; all who seek admittance are required either to supply credentials of qualification to do college work, or are given tests to prove it. Faculty members are assigned by the University departments in the same manner that they are assigned to Columbia College and Barnard.

Regular Faculty on "Overload" Basis. Recruitment of full-time faculty members on the basis of extra pay has long been an almost universal practice in extension and continuing education. This has been, up to the present time, the easiest way to get the job done in a satisfactory manner. It assured university-quality teaching for what was intended to be university-quality extension work, without putting an added strain on the regular university budget. It provided a legitimate way of giving added monetary compensation to young faculty members whose beginning salaries were often too low adequately to support families, and a way of providing other faculty with an opportunity to supplement modest salaries from time to time with needed outside earnings. It provided young and old with useful teaching experience—for many, more satisfying than on-campus teaching.

But it also creates an anomalous situation with respect to over-all university policy. Herbert Longenecker noted that "the practice of allowing extra compensation for extra services rendered during the academic year can be regarded as a recognition that the full-time service of the faculty member has not, in fact, been arranged for by the budgeted salary. Justifications made for the continuation of this practice are variable, but none of them deny this point of view. Any such extra payment strains the principle that the budgeted salary is intended to provide for the full-time service of the faculty member."[9]

---

[8] In some universities, extension staff members are given "joint appointments" in campus departments.

Longenecker reports that in one institution, where faculty assignments to teaching tended to be less than twelve hours a week, individuals might teach from four to five hours per semester in extension for $520 additional for each semester. "The plan helped to maintain the faculty against calls for them to move elsewhere."

Attitudes of faculty members I talked with about the overload pay plan ranged all the way from appreciation to downright bitterness:

"I like teaching adults," said a professor of biology, "because they want to learn, and there's nothing that pleases a teacher more than to work with those who want to learn."

"Teaching in extension helped me build a garage two years ago," said another professor. "It's good to know there's a way of making some extra money when you need it."

"I think it's a good thing for young instructors," said another. "I'm afraid not many of them would stick out a university career if they had to live off what they make at the start."

"It's a wage slave arrangement, and unfair all around," said a department head in one university. "The university, through its extension, makes teaching commitments which we have to meet, paying faculty a flat scale below regular faculty rates. As a result, it's getting more and more difficult to recruit them."

Some university extension divisions have attempted to work out a graduated scale of pay to attract higher ranking faculty members. The University of Michigan, for example, has a much higher allowance for professors than for instructors. In all universities visited, extension directors reported that it was getting more and more difficult to get the more experienced faculty members to teach. And it is clear that there will always be a difficulty in recruitment of teachers for extension service as long as the work is considered outside the academic framework—a kind of second class employment.

---

[9] Herbert Longenecker, University Faculty Compensation Policies and Practices in the U.S. (University of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 105.

Faculty-Approved Non-Faculty Teachers. In the face of the growth of university extension credit class activities, and the difficulty in getting qualified members of the regular faculty to teach, there has been a trend toward the part-time employment of qualified outside personnel. Where these are credit classes, the instructor's credentials have to be reviewed by the chairman of the subject matter department. In some institutions and in some departments this review is very thorough; in others it is simply a matter of form.

At the University of California, Southern area, seventy per cent of the extension division's teachers were non-faculty. A large percentage of these teach in the evening engineering division. "We couldn't conduct this program without them," said the dean. "Most of them are highly trained; many have doctorates."

Faculty members in most universities are inclined to take a dim view of such a high percentage of non-faculty people, even though the latter are highly qualified. "I don't think the problem is one of numbers—or percentages," commented one Midwestern dean; "it's a problem of providing a sense of institutional identity, a feeling for our instructional programs, and an attitude of being one of us. Some system of close supervision has been suggested and rebutted by me as a negative approach to a situation which requires positive action. If a positive program of orientation or of indoctrination, if you will, can be devised, the number of non-staff persons teaching off campus, in my opinion, can be increased without alarming consequences." Without such a program, however, he felt that no more than thirty per cent of extension teaching could safely be done by non-staff personnel.

This is about the percentage of non-staff teachers currently engaged in extension at the University of Michigan. At Illinois, only around twenty per cent of extension teachers are non-faculty.

Non-Faculty Teachers for Informal Classes. Faculty members and extension directors were unanimous in agreeing that non-faculty teachers employed for credit classes must be cleared by appropriate subject matter departments. There was some feeling, however, that where non-credit classes were involved, the extension division should be free to use its own judgment without reference to the faculty. In fact, some of the latter felt that no regular faculty members should be involved in non-credit work.

Yet in most of the institutions visited, extension directors as a matter of courtesy "cleared" non-faculty teachers of informal classes with appropriate department heads, on the sound ground that they should have some assurance that the quality of instruction would be of university level.

In New York University's unique adult education operation, the Division of General Education, only ten per cent of the teachers are regular NYU faculty members. The other ninety per cent of the Division's teachers come from the literary, artistic, and scientific world of Manhattan.

In the face of rising student enrollments, which place a strain on faculty resources and campus facilities alike, universities seem to be taking a new look at extension credit programs. Some, looking for ways and means of integrating them into the regular program, are turning to the "extended day" idea. The hope is that with regular faculty members assigned to teach both day and late afternoon and evening classes, some of the stigma which has been attached to extension credit classes will be removed. It will also mollify faculty members who have for years opposed the practice of overload pay for what was, to all intents and purposes, regular work. Furthermore, having regular faculty members get more experience in teaching adults should help break down the hostile stereotype of adult education.

In some subject areas this regular assignment policy may result in the employment of fewer non-faculty teachers. In others, where a scarcity already exists (engineering is an example), it will probably make no difference. One eastern professor said he felt that we would see a considerable increase in non-faculty teachers in universities in the near future, particularly in science and technology. "It is the only way in which the universities can keep up with developments in business, industry, and government research."

5. Self-Support Versus Subsidy

No one in our society expects any aspect of formal education to be completely self-supporting. Nobody expects the average child's parents to pay the full cost of his education at either the kindergarten or the college level. The theory behind this is that one of the purposes of a society which prizes the individual is to assure him maximum opportunity for education. Furthermore, it is assumed that society as a whole, as well as the individual educated, benefits from this increased learning. The more education the individual has, the more productive he is, the more aware of the world, the more responsible he can be to himself and in discharging his obligations as a citizen. But when as an adult the individual seeks further education, there is a strong feeling among both educators and members of the public that he ought to pay the full cost.

Arguments advanced have a strong surface persuasion: An adult is presumably employed, making money, and in full charge of his life. If he wants to advance or continue his education, he should pay the full cost. If it is at some sacrifice, this is a test of his maturity.

Following this line of reasoning, a great many university extension operations—particularly those in the highly urban areas—have been expected to support themselves. In some instances, notably NYU's Division of General Education, these activities have earned a profit, which is used to help finance other educational activities of the University.

The argument for self-support is perhaps stronger for private universities than it is for those enjoying public support. Most state universities have some kind of service commitment to the adult populations of their respective states. And while the extent and nature of this responsibility is variously interpreted—both by university administrations and by the legislatures responsible for appropriations—the principle of responsibility is clearly established in most cases. Sometimes this is written into the statutes establishing the university purposes, as in the case of the University of Michigan. Sometimes it is the simple iteration and reiteration of administrative policy (as in the case of the presidential statements at the University of Washington cited earlier).

The argument for some public subsidy for a university extension operation hinges, in a very fundamental sense, upon the notion that provision of adequate and widely available continuing education opportunities for adults is, in a democracy, a societal as well as an individual need. Just as society has a stake in the adequate provision of a balanced program of education for the young, it has a stake in the provision of a balanced program of continuing education for the adult. Programs for adults which have to be entirely self-supported are inevitably out of balance. They reach a necessarily limited audience, and one which is either highly vocational or highly degree-oriented. Immediate and urgent consumer needs and interests inevitably dictate the nature of the program, and the university has little opportunity to experiment with new offerings, or to call attention to important subjects that may initially attract only a few people. Lyman Bryson once addressed himself to the problem of distinguishing between "urgent" and "important." "Because we think that the important things can wait until the urgent things are settled, we frequently end by getting nothing settled. The urgent problem of today is very likely to exist because the important problem of yesterday was never tackled."[10] Since in the very purpose of a university is embedded the notion of giving attention to the important problems of human existence, it would seem to be betraying its own destiny if—even in peripheral activities—it yielded chiefly to the demand of the urgent. In brief, a program of continuing education which has to be entirely self-supporting tends to become a completely "service" oriented program as distinct from one oriented to "education" in the truest sense of the term.

A majority of the faculty members, deans, and central administration officers I talked with expressed the initial opinion that university extension activities should be either "fully" or "largely" self-supporting. I say "initial opinion" because many, after discussion of the problem, amended their views—not because of any arguments I advanced for subsidy, but because the implication of the "self-support" principle became clear to them even as they talked. A dean would start out by saying that "of course extension should be self-supporting; after all it is largely vocational and recreational," and then pause and admit that maybe it was largely vocational and recreational because it had to be self-supporting.

The problem is complicated by the fact that one cannot make an across-the-board generalization. The question becomes one of what programs should be subsidized and what ones made self-supporting.

---

10. Lyman Bryson, "What We Mean by Adult Education," Handbook of Adult Education in the U.S. (Columbia University Teachers College, 1948), pp. 3-6.

"I find it difficult to justify more than a single answer for each situation," said one Midwestern university dean. "I begin with the question: As a matter of educational policy, to what extent, or perhaps from what source, should an institution support its educational programs? And follow with the question: What policy implications are to be found when some educational programs are either not supported or unequally supported, from general funds available to the institution?

"I draw no adverse conclusions if a program gets, say, one hundred per cent support if the program is really experimental in character or has inherent distinguishing qualities. On the other hand, I am not disturbed to know that a program—say, one designed and conducted for the benefit of an acknowledged interest group, like contract research or teaching, group consultation, etc.—is required to be one hundred per cent self-supporting. Somewhere between these extremes lies the solid educational program of the institution. It is in this area that I find my doubts. If, as a matter of policy, the general education program finds sixty to eighty per cent support from general institutional funds and twenty to forty per cent from program revenues (student fees, etc.), I fear that any sharp deviation from such a norm in support of either summer session or continuing education raises serious questions of institutional commitment. In other words, 'poor relations' should not be treated as such unless they are so designated."

In most extension operations which are required to pay their way, or to be almost self-supporting, sponsorship of a heavily vocational and partially "non-university level" program is justified on the ground that such activities more than pay for themselves and help finance thinly attended liberal arts courses.

Within nearly all subsidized extension division programs a distinction is made between those activities which justify subsidization and those that do not. Thus, at the University of Illinois, the relatively well-subsidized university extension operation demands that its Allerton House short courses and conferences program be self-supporting. The University of California's Arrowhead Lake Center is run on the same basis.

The newly established Wayne State University-University of Michigan Division of Adult Education in Detroit is given what amounts to a subsidy of twenty per cent of its total budget—enough to cover administrative costs. Otherwise, this program of non-credit activities is supposed to be self-supporting.

The Regents of the University of California in 1912 recommended to the Legislature that the "ready-to-serve" costs of University Extension should be provided by state support in order that the educational services should not be completely dependent on the ability of the learner to pay. In reaffirming this policy in 1953, the Regents recommended that state support should not exceed twenty-five per cent of the gross expenditure budget.

Michigan State University is presently providing a considerable subsidy for the short course and conference program built around the new Center for Continuing Education, but hopes, as time goes on, to build this up to a point approaching self-support.

The University of Michigan has no exact figures on the subsidy provided its Extension Division, but it is estimated to run better than fifty per cent.

Harvard University's Commission on Extension Courses is able to make ends meet and keep student fees low because the operation is relatively small, and it gets an annual subsidy from the Lowell Institute. This is the only instance that I know of in which a university extension gets anything like an endowment. It is perhaps significant that William Rainey Harper—who tried to make Extension a major part of the University of Chicago's academic structure—was never able to get any kind of an endowment for this aspect of the University's work.

To sum up: acceptance of the self-support principle as a means of financing university extension activities in institutions that normally subsidize other educational work automatically removes it from the university's academic framework and places it squarely in the category of the "special and peculiar." The issue here, therefore, is very closely related to the very first issue we raised: Is extension—or continuing education or "service"—to be considered an integral or a peripheral operation of the university?

The fact that New York University's Division of General Education has to be self-supporting is not resented by the Division, because most of the other units in the University also have to be self-supporting. But in state universities, where subsidy accounts for a large part of the regular university income, demand that extension and continuing education be completely self-supporting creates an anomalous situation.

The amount of subsidy—whether around twenty-five per cent (as many central administrators who accept the subsidy principle seem to feel is adequate) or around fifty per cent (which would satisfy most extension directors)—must depend on the local institutional situation, and is susceptible of a variety of satisfactory solutions. But acceptance or rejection of the principle of partial subsidy as opposed to the principle of complete self-support is a crucial factor in the projection of any university's role in continuing education.

Some kind of scholarship plan has been suggested as a possible variant on the subsidy principle. Tuition could be set to cover costs, but adequate scholarships made available to those for whom fee payment would be a hardship.

FOUR: COMPETITION, COOPERATION, AND COORDINATION

A spirit of competition is endemic in American life. This is a business dominated culture, wherein a capacity successfully to compete is not only essential for individuals but also for institutions. Universities compete for gifts, students, faculty members, as well as scholastic, athletic, and research honors. In addition, public universities (in the same state) compete with each other and to some extent with other educational agencies for state funds.

In this competition, university extension has often been looked upon by its parent body as a useful public relations tool. ". . . Although no one says so in print," reported a Committee on Extension at the University of Iowa, "extension activities are often seen as an arm of the public relations of the University. Do something for the oil jobbers, the homeopaths, and the innkeepers, the thinking seems to go; they'll like you for it, and that's public relations. Evidence of this kind of thinking is apparent in the extension listings of many institutions. . . . Such thinking represents a curious misapprehension both of the nature of educational public relations and of the function of the extension division."[1] Many state universities found the Wisconsin slogan, "the state is our campus," highly attractive to use in publicity, although few put as much substance behind the phrase as its originator.

But just as competition in the business world is no longer as openly ruthless as it was early in the century, so competition in the university world shows some signs of abatement. Thus, a team of Columbia University professors can say, "Within the metropolitan area, Columbia may properly see itself as one among other elements in an implicit university of the City of New York. The diverse institutions are not joined legally, as in London, nor should they be. It is not less appropriate, however, that Columbia, as a member of the congeries, should take account of the services of the whole in shaping its own role."[2] One of the compelling arguments used by those who favored a more carefully screened student body for the University's School of General Studies was the availability of other university-sponsored adult programs in New York City.

---

[1] "Report of the Special Committee (of the University of Iowa) on the Extension Division," March 1960, mimeo, p. 5.

More than fifty years ago, President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard had a vision of a cooperative program of extension courses in the Boston area. He invited six other institutions of higher education in the Boston area to join with Harvard in establishing the Commission on Extension Courses. He secured a continuing subsidy from the Lowell Institute designed to keep down the fees, assigned a member of the Harvard faculty to be part-time director, and recruited teachers from the faculties of the associated institutions. The courses were offered for credit toward a special Adjunct in the Arts degree, which might be offered by any of the cooperating institutions.

Although the Commission had the trappings of a cooperative venture, it is fairly clear that from the beginning it was essentially a Harvard venture. The director was a Harvard faculty man, the Commission's offices were in the Harvard Yard. There have been no meetings of the Commission members since 1924. Other institutions—Boston College, Boston University, Tufts, Northeastern—have gone on to develop their own extension programs.

Yet the idea behind this Commission—unrealized as it is—has a quality of boldness and originality which is arresting even today. If the member institutions could have worked together in this Commission, what a difference it might have made on the continuing education scene in Boston today!

The work that private universities do together has to be voluntary, because it is the nature of a privately supported institution to be independent. And while it is quite true that today their independence is more apparent than real—they benefit from tax exemption and government aid in the form of scholarships, contracts for services and other kinds of assistance—their service commitments (if any) to the community are voluntarily assumed. The motivation may be economic, a sense of obligation, or "public relations." It may stem from a basic educational philosophy.

---

[2] Report of the President's Committee on the Educational Future of the University (Columbia University Press, 1957), pp. 4-5.

The state-supported university faces a different problem. It is not an independent institution. It has to answer regularly to the people of the state through their elected representatives. It has to compete with other state-supported educational institutions—and often with other state-supported universities—for funds.

State universities—in their origins at least—represented a different tradition from the one which American universities inherited from Europe. The University of Illinois was founded in 1868 as an "industrial university," designed primarily to serve the liberal education needs of the farming and laboring population of the state.[3]

Most of the private universities were built on a religious denominational base on which was erected a liberal arts college, providing education basic for later training for the "elite" professions: law, the ministry, and medicine.

The state universities were set up on a non-denominational base, and on the implicit—if not always explicit—premise that a broad liberal education was necessary for all people in a democratic society, whether they were preparing for the elite professions, or the "non-elite" vocations. A university education, the founders of the early state universities said in effect, is not to be limited to a few professional classes in society; it should be made available to all who can take advantage of it.

In a message to the first Legislature of the Territory of Washington (February 28, 1854), Governor Isaac Ingalls Stevens put into words the feelings of many pioneers who cleared the ground for the development of our system of free public education when he said, "The subject of education already occupies the minds and hearts of the citizens of this territory, and I feel confident that they will aim at nothing less than a system which shall place within the means of all the full development of the capacities with which they have been endowed. Let every youth, however limited his opportunities, find his place in the school, the college, or the university, if God has given him the necessary gifts."

---

[3] "Our university," says an editorial in the Illini, June, 1874, "is founded . . . upon quite a different idea from that of older schools. It is dedicated to the industries of our age. It is devoted to the interests of the sons and daughters of toil. Its mission is to dignify and exalt labor, by making labor intelligent and rational. Not learning alone, not labor alone, but the fruitful union of learning and labor is the important problem for its solution."

That passage, with the change of a single word (I would change "youth" to "individual"), stands as fresh and challenging for the citizen of the U.S. in 1960 as it did for the citizen of the Territory of Washington in 1854.

Granted the feasibility of the goals made explicit in this bold declaration, the crucial operative noun is "system." "A system which will place within the means of all. . . ."

This brings me—by a rather roundabout route—to the final, and to me very important, difference between the intention of the state university and that of the private university. Those who worked for the establishment of the former saw it as part of a well articulated "system" of publicly supported education, which shall "place within the means of all the full development of the capacities with which they have been endowed."

One of the most interesting examples of the early thinking about the way in which such a system might be brought into existence is to be found in the early history of the University of Michigan. This University gives 1817 as its date of origin, the year of the founding of the Catholepistemiad of Michigania. This oddly named institution was established in Detroit by a Catholic priest, Father Richard, and A. A. B. Woodward, a prominent Detroiter who prided himself on being a free-thinker. Woodward had worked out for himself a system of universal knowledge in which he attempted to classify all learning into thirteen categories (didaxiim), and the new institution took its name from the thirteenth "didaxium": catholepistemia (universal science).

The Catholepistemiad was an ambitious undertaking embodying an idea for a state system of education very similar to that embraced in the 1784 Board of Regents plan for the State of New York. A set of "didactors" (teachers) were to be appointed by the governor and paid out of public funds. They were not only to be "instructors" in the "university" (the heart of the Catholepistemiad plan) but also to constitute a corporate body empowered to "appoint other teachers, establish colleges, academies, schools, libraries, museums, athenaeums, botanical gardens, laboratories and other useful literary and scientific institutions." In brief, to establish a statewide system of education.

The Catholepistemiad never got off the ground as an operating institution. But when Michigan became a state in 1837, and the first legislature passed what became known as the organic act to establish a University of Michigan, many of its features were incorporated in the charter for the new institution. Among them were implicit powers to set up and operate a broad system of education for the state.

The University's first president. Henry P. Tappan, ignored this mandate and went on to develop a university patterned after the scholar-oriented German university system with which he was familiar. As a result, the University of Michigan took on much of the shape and purpose of a distinguished private university.

Today, with three large universities competing for funds from the taxpayers of a single state, many look back a little wistfully on the idea of a unified educational system embodied in the old Catholepistemiad. The state legislature, alarmed at rising costs, and possible unnecessary duplication of activities and facilities, has said: cooperate—or else. The "or else" is of course the threat of enforced coordination.

In view of this situation it is perhaps not surprising that tentative steps toward the erection of a workable framework for inter-institutional cooperation among state institutions of higher learning have been made in Michigan. There has been some talk of a merger of the three universities. A few years ago Wayne and the University of Michigan came very close to merging their respective institutions.

One of the results of all this high level consideration of problems of coordination has been to stimulate greater cooperation among the "peripheral" service units of the universities. A few years ago a cooperative study of adult education activities was undertaken chiefly to determine the extent of overlapping services. John Dale Russell recently directed a survey of institutions of higher learning in the state, which gave thoughtful attention to the extension services.

Wayne—University of Michigan Division of Adult Education

One concrete result flowing from all this was the decision to establish a jointly supported (Wayne-University of Michigan) Division of Adult

Education in Detroit. This Division was established in 1957. Under an able administrator, and with an Advisory Committee containing representatives from both universities, it has gotten off to a good start. It is being closely watched by administrators in both parent institutions. If it is successful, it may be encouraged to spread its operation to other parts of the state. If this happens, it will inevitably—and ultimately—be competing with the extension operations of the third member of the Michigan triumvirate, Michigan State University, which has proven itself to be no mean competitor in this and in other fields.

Some observers believe that the Division constitutes the first step toward the creation of a semi-autonomous, state-wide, non-credit university extension service, which will enjoy the support and sponsorship of all the state institutions of higher learning. But others are not so sure. Unless and until the parent institutions find a viable mechanism for cooperation, they say, they are not likely to let these activities grow away from them. Informal education programs—construed as "service"—are, as we have seen, often viewed as useful instruments for institutional expansion, and as long as this seems both possible and desirable, no university is going voluntarily to surrender control of them. In other words, there probably will be no formal coordination of extension activities until there is coordination of the institutions of higher learning themselves.

The Oregon State Plan

What happens to a university's extension service when the university becomes a part of a firmly coordinated state-wide system of higher education? This was the chief question I had in my mind when I paid a visit to the Oregon State System of Higher Education. The System, established in 1932, was put through because the Oregon legislators got tired of the constant bickering over allocation of functions and money that went on between the state's major institutions of higher learning: the University of Oregon at Eugene and the Oregon Agricultural College (later Oregon State College; now Oregon State University). Within this system of higher education, which includes the state colleges, the legislature established a Division of General Extension, coordinate with the universities and colleges.

The state-wide, semi-autonomous university extension service, at which Michigan seems to be making some tentative passes, is here a reality. But here, as elsewhere in the picture of higher education today, it is obvious that nothing can really be established "from scratch." History is always present, and an examination of the history of the activity of the Division of General Extension shows it to be chiefly an extension of the University of Oregon's General Extension Division.

This history parallels that of a great many other state university extension operations. Off-campus lectures began around 1893; in 1908 a correspondence study program was initiated; in 1917 an Extension Center was established in Portland; and a state-wide class program was set in operation in 1923.

From the beginning, the Extension Center in Portland was the heart of the Extension operation. Portland is the big population center of the state. It has always wanted a state university of its own. The University Extension operation there for years had served as a kind of sop to keep the city quiet. (Once a university campus was set up in the state's population center, it was said, what would happen to the University of Oregon in Eugene?)

When the State System was established, it was natural that the Division of General Extension should be built on the University's extension operation, and that its headquarters should be in Portland. It was also natural that, once it was possessed of its own semi-autonomous operation and a big evening enrollment, pressure developed to make the Division a "real college." Just after the second World War, when the GI-bill veterans began to storm the universities, the State System empowered the Division to set up and operate a two-year college at a site near Portland. A drive was then opened to set up a four-year college in Portland. This was achieved in 1955, when Portland State College came into existence.

The new college grew rapidly. This year (1959-60) it had a total of around 10,000 students—larger than either the University of Oregon or Oregon State: 4,000 attending in the day-time and 6,000 in the evening. It is not yet disengaged from its "parent," the Division of General Extension; and to avoid confusion the authorities had to draw an arbitrary jurisdictional line: all activities in the college before 5 o'clock were under the college proper; all activities after that time were under the

Division's administration. The day is probably not far distant when the College will take over all credit work, day and evening, perhaps on the extended day pattern followed at Wayne and the California state colleges. If and when this occurs, the General Extension Division will undoubtedly face a major reorganization.

It is clear that under the Oregon State System of Higher Education the extension activities of the member institutions have been, to a great extent, effectively coordinated. Since these activities are still largely self-supporting, however, and faculty members teaching in extension are still paid on an "overload" basis, it cannot be said to be an "integrated" operation. Furthermore, the Agricultural Extension Service in Oregon, which has always constituted Oregon State's principal extension activity, has never been brought into the coordinated system. If and when it is combined with University Extension (and there are those who prophesy that this time is not far distant) the Oregon venture will indeed be something to watch.

California's Emerging "Three Track System"

The State of California is currently embarked on what is undoubtedly the boldest adventure designed to assure opportunities for higher education ever undertaken by any people at any time, anywhere. The dimensions of this vast publicly supported undertaking are sobering. It involves the University of California with its seven different campuses, together with 14 state colleges and 54 two-year junior colleges. On the basis of present population projections, enrollments in this enormous enterprise are scheduled to more than double in size in the next ten years.

In view of this situation everyone is worried. Educators are worried about maintaining the quality of education in the face of this rapid growth. The legislators, and the people they represent, are worried about the rising cost of expanding, and maintaining, this colossal undertaking.

Problems are further exacerbated by the fact that this adventure in higher education has been going forward under a divided command. There is a Board of Regents of the University of California, controlling a growing "empire" of university campuses extending all the way from Davis (near Sacramento) in the north to La Jolla (near San Diego) in the south. Its charter is embedded in the state's constitution, and it has operated as a nearly autonomous body from its beginning. It has exercised what amounts to a monopoly over the granting of advanced degrees, and for advanced training in the professions of law, medicine, engineering, business management, and others. There is also a State Board of Education, which sets up standards for public school education in the state, disburses state aid, and controls the fourteen state colleges. The junior colleges are for the most part locally supported, two-year extensions of the public high schools.

Problem: How can these three elements of a "system" of higher education be brought together? For some time it has been apparent that they were in covert—and sometimes overt—competition for funds. Various schemes were proposed for bringing about voluntary cooperation, but little came of them. When the present governor of California came into office, he decided that something had to be done, or he would recommend a single system of higher education similar perhaps to the one in existence in Oregon.

A Master Plan Committee was set up, with representatives from the University, the state colleges and junior colleges, and the private colleges involved. The Committee came up with a plan in February, 1960, which took the form of a proposed constitutional amendment, the major provisions of which were (1) the establishment of a board of trustees for the state colleges, similar to the board of regents for the University; (2) the creation of a Coordinating Council for Higher Education, with representatives from all segments of higher education, public and private, which would coordinate the planning of the Regents and the State Board, particularly on budgetary matters; and (3) a reaffirmation of the University's sole authority to award the doctor's degree, as well as of its role as the "primary state-supported academic agency for research."

Among other recommendations was one touching the problem of admissions: it was recommended that the state colleges select freshmen from the top 33-1/3 per cent of the public high schools, and the University would draw from the upper 12-1/2 per cent. (The junior colleges would take on the rest—the upper 45 per cent adjudged good risks for at least two years of college.) This would lay the groundwork for the development of a "three track" system of higher education.

Perhaps the most significant recommendation of the report dealing with the future of adult education was that calling for a differentiation "between those enrollees who are pursuing a stated planned program with definite occupational or liberal education objectives, and those who are enrolling in single courses for which matriculation or prerequisites are absent."

To understand the implications of this plan for a future coordinated program of adult education in California, it is necessary to consider what has happened in this field up to this time. Around the three "systems" of higher education that have grown up to date, three different "programs" for adult education have emerged:

University of California Program. The first and largest, of course, is the University of California Extension Division. This operation, which got under way in Berkeley in 1912 with a biennial budget of $25,000, now has an annual budget of nearly $7 million. According to a recent fact-sheet on University Extension activities, 383,000 individuals in the state were served in 1957-58 with "university level adult education opportunities" of one kind or another. Programs were offered on six campuses (Davis, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Riverside, Santa Barbara, and San Francisco) and 500 other locations. Programs offered included vocational and job improvement courses (in private industry and government service), extension credit courses for those seeking degrees, continuing educational activities for professional people—doctors, lawyers, dentists, businessmen, teachers, etc.—and for plain lay citizens interested in continuing their own intellectual growth and in broadening cultural horizons.

For operational purposes the Extension Service has long been divided into two sections: one centered in Berkeley is responsible for activities north of the Tehachapi range of mountains; the other, at Los Angeles, covers the rest of the state.

State College Program. "The primary function of the state colleges is the training of teachers," says a California Legislature report for 1947. However, it adds, "state colleges may also offer courses appropriate for general or liberal education and for responsible citizenship; offer vocational training in such fields as business, industry, preprofessional courses needed by students who plan to transfer to universities for advanced study. . . ."

Initially, about the only extension work done in the colleges was that reflected in their Extended Day programs. These were the late afternoon and evening (4:30 to 10:00 P.M.) classes provided on campus for students who were working and could not attend full time, or who for other reasons could not get into classes held in the regular day-time periods. The Extended Day courses were actually a part of the regular college program: credit-bearing courses included in the college catalog, taught by faculty members as part of their regular teaching responsibilities.

While most of those attending these classes were degree-seeking students, a substantial number were simply people of all ages who were interested in self-improvement, vocational upgrading, or the subject being taught, and had no real concern for credit toward a degree. The latter were generally classed as "limited" students.

In addition to the Extended Day program, nearly all of the state colleges offer an extension program of some kind or another. These extension divisions conduct off-campus activities. Since these are not within the scope of activities for which the state provided subsidy, they have to be self-supporting. Because they have to be self-supporting, fees for extension classes are higher than for the same courses taught on campus. (At the time of my visit a three-unit Extended Day class cost the student $9.00; the same course, taught in Extension, cost $25.50.) Although most of the Extension classes were taught by regular College faculty members, they were paid on an "overload" basis.

As might be expected, there is a wide divergence in the scope and character of extension programming from state college to state college. The San Francisco State College, for example, has almost as rich and varied a program of offerings as that offered by the University of California (a high compliment, for University Extension has become noted in recent years for the imagination displayed in entering new fields of activity).

Junior College Program. Junior college-sponsored programs of continuing education constitute the third system we have to consider in California. Since most of the junior colleges are considered to be part of the local public school systems in the areas in which they exist such activities as they conduct for adults are often closely interrelated with the public school adult education program. The Extended Day program arrangement, already discussed in connection with the state colleges, operates here. Fifty-three day junior colleges had adult classes, enrolling a total of 212,888 students, in the 1958-59 fall semester.

Junior college "extension" programs, like the state college programs, show considerable variation from community to community. In general, however, about a third of the courses offer vocational training in one form or another; another third, academic subjects: history, social sciences, foreign languages, mathematics, and science. The rest deal with homemaking, parent education, fine arts, crafts, Americanization, and health and physical education.

The public school adult program draws support from four sources: (1) the state, which apportions aid on the basis of average daily attendance to approved adult classes; (2) local school tax funds; (3) student fees; and (4) federal funds for certain types of vocational programs. The ratio of local funds to state funds is about 55 to 45.

Given three separate publicly-supported systems of higher education in a single state, each undertaking to sponsor continuing education activities of one kind or another, there is bound to be some tension and conflict. Areas of influence and responsibility—never very clearly defined—tend more and more to become subjects of dispute. Adult education—so everyone says—is a "coming field." Therefore, all public education institutions that have ever staked out a claim want to hang on to it. (They may not be able to do much about it just now, but they want to be sure their prerogatives for doing something are not disturbed.) This "market" approach to education is always strong where there is active and open competition for funds. Adults become not individuals to "serve," in the old-fashioned sense of that term, but "customers" to entice.

The conflict became so strenuous that several years ago the parent institutions had to move to set up a Liaison Committee made up of representatives of the contending operations, to work out some rules for cooperation. A set of "Guidelines" emerged in 1957 to provide a framework for such cooperation.

The statement suggests some "appropriate" assignments of responsibility for the different agencies—but adds, "Allocations of responsibilities are not to be thought of as mutually exclusive and in any given community will be determined by application of the processes of communication and negotiation already recommended."

The Committee—using the "Guidelines" adopted—has to date made some progress toward a rationally cooperative, state-wide "system" of adult education. But it has a long way to go. The California situation is not typical of the country as a whole, but it illustrates all of the central issues implicit in the theme of this chapter: competition, cooperation, and coordination in adult education.

It has launched, as we said at the outset, the boldest experiment in public education ever undertaken. It acts sometimes (as it is acting right now) as if it were frightened to death of its own boldness, and seems to be doing everything it can to put difficulties in the way of its own success. But it seems to me that it has gone too far and been too successful to back down on itself at this stage. The Master Plan, for all its deficiencies, seems to provide a potentially workable framework within which future competition and cooperation (both of which are necessary) can take place. Even as I write, the affected institutions are moving to work out necessary reorganizations that will enable them to operate effectively. The major problem in the future seems to be to develop, among the institutions concerned, a will to cooperate. Otherwise, further measures looking to a tightening of coordination seem inevitable.

A quotation from a recent University of California president is pertinent here: "Democracy is the resolution to remove those actual and unnecessary divergences of interest that are the springs of class war; to replace class consciousness by public sensitiveness; to stimulate the willingness of men to recognize, without envy, inequality of function and also of talent."[4]

Substituting the idea "educational institution" for "class," this has a certain cogent relevance to the current situation, not only in California, but elsewhere.

---

[4] Quoted in James Creese, op. cit., p. 9.

FIVE: SUMMARY—AND SOME CONCLUSIONS

This report rests on the view that a university is in essence a community of scholars, and that its major purposes are the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge.

The university has integrity only to the extent that the individual faculty members have integrity. And it is a community of scholars only to the extent that its members have a sense of community, a shared feeling of common purpose. As I tried to indicate earlier, powerful forces are at work in universities today—particularly the larger ones—which tend to undermine the individual scholars and their sense of community.

Universities are getting too large, and too complex. Units within them are becoming isolated; and the members of the faculty are becoming alienated from one another. There is a tendency today to look upon the universities—particularly those that are state-supported, as a kind of "natural resource," open to unlimited exploitation. Foundations, government agencies, private associations and individual citizens have felt free to come to the universities for teaching and research "assistance." There are rumblings of discontent in some faculties.

Public Service: An Unassimilated Function

For more than seven hundred years, up to the beginning of this century, most universities have acknowledged only two functions: research and teaching. Over the last fifty years there has been gradual, and reluctant, acknowledgment of a third function: service. This embraces, as was noted earlier—extension credit offerings, educational services and continuing education. This function was not assumed voluntarily by the "community of scholars." It was imposed. And while today it is widely accepted, close examination of universities will show that it has not been fully assimilated.

What may be called the public service functions—as distinct from regular teaching and research activities—have today infiltrated nearly every aspect of university life. A good many, although by no means all, of the university-sponsored activities which fall under the heading of "service" are frequently administered through an extension division.

Broadly speaking, these activities may be grouped into three categories.

1. Extension education: The provision—off-campus, in evening hours, through correspondence, etc.—of those credit bearing educational opportunities (or their equivalents) made available within the "university proper."

2. Educational services: The adaption of the resources of the university to the felt needs and interests of adults without regard to age, sex, religion, or previous condition of academic servitude; said service to be rendered individuals, special groups, organizations and agencies, upon request.

3. Continuing education: The selection, provision and promotion of intellectually demanding educational activities prepared especially for adults who have done with formal schooling; designed to enhance the quality of individuals as individuals and increase their effectiveness in their vocations or professions and as citizens of a free society.[1]

In rendering the first type of service, the university is expanding the scope of a long accepted responsibility: academic higher education.

In rendering the second, it is exhibiting responsiveness to a variety of educational demands; undertaking activities which it does not initiate, and over which it exercises only a kind of negative control.

In undertaking the third, the university is taking the initiative in developing continuing education opportunities for adults; identifying (with the help of the community) those subjects about which people need further education, as well as those in which they are already interested; devising ways of getting people to give them attention; setting up cooperative learning situations designed to make sustained intellectual demands upon participants. In short, in undertaking continuing education, the university is establishing a service that is both responsive and responsible.

---

[1] ". . . The university's natural community," wrote James Creese some twenty years ago, "is not necessarily the whole population of a political area bounded by city or state lines. For a college of medicine, the natural community is that of the local physicians; for the school of education it is the community of teachers and schoolmen; and for the engineering college it is the community of engineers, industrial executives, foremen and skilled workmen of industry. To these special communities within communities the university has an obligation in higher adult education." (James Creese, op. cit., p. 83.)

Let me illustrate the three types.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education, like many universities, offers correspondence courses for credit in such subjects as the American Indian, House Planning and Architectural Drawing, History of Western Civilization, Mathematics of Finance, etc. These courses are the equivalent of regular courses in the subjects offered on one or more of the college campuses that make up the Oregon System, and credit earned can be applied, up to a point, toward a regular degree from any of these institutions.

Wayne State University sponsors an industrial training operation called the Material Management Center. This was established a number of years ago in response to requests from local industry for help in training in "packaging." The operation is self-supporting, and the fact that it has continued to be successful would seem to indicate that it is serving a felt need of a special industrial group. Courses are tailored to participants; no academic requirements govern participation.

The University of California, through its Extension Division, has been active in initiating opportunities for continuing education in the liberal arts. It recently devised, and widely promoted, a study-discussion program "Politics 1960," which laid out a plan—and provided material—for an objective examination of some of the emerging issues of the coming presidential campaign.

In offering extension education, the university is making available—with as little change as possible—what it provides in the university proper.

In offering educational services, the university is responding as flexibly as possible to expressed interests and needs of individuals, groups, and organizations in the community.

In offering continuing education opportunities, it takes into consideration social and civic needs as well as those of immediate concern to individuals and organizations, and initiates and promotes intellectually demanding learning opportunities appropriate to them.

It is true that what I've called "educational services" and what I term "continuing education" frequently overlap. The major distinction lies in where the initiative rests. If a university as a matter of policy announces that it sponsors educational activities outside its formal academic program, only upon request, we can class these as educational services. If the university, on its own initiative, devises courses and promotes them, it is sponsoring continuing education.

In a program oriented around educational services, the word "curriculum" has no meaning, since the activities are only the sum of responses to requests that represent personal and special group interests that are urgent and immediate. In a continuing education program there should be a conscious movement toward a curriculum which will balance social and individual needs and interests; urgent and important demands.

Five Major Issues

What a university actually does about any one of the three types of service noted above, depends on the answers given to five questions:

1. Is the service to be considered an integral part of, or peripheral to, the university?
2. Is it to be carried out in a decentralized or centralized fashion?
3. Is it to be a credit or a non-credit activity?
4. Will it involve regular faculty members—or non-faculty members? On what basis?
5. Will it be fully self-supporting or partly subsidized? Integral or peripheral?

University extension has long been to all intents and purposes a kind of quasi-peripheral function of the university. Faculty members have taught in it, but usually on an extra-time basis. Extension courses have carried credit toward regular degrees, but been considered inferior to "campus courses," Although extension personnel have, through joint appointment, been given a measure of status as members of the community of scholars, they have never been wholly accepted. Meanwhile, extension division activities have grown steadily—as have service activities of all kinds within the university.

There is now evidence that some universities are moving to make at least one aspect of extension service truly integral to the university. This is extension education (credit toward regular degree work conducted in the evening or off-campus). Always constituting a substantial part of the educational program of universities in urban areas, the extension credit classes are bound to increase as more and more students are finding it necessary to pursue academic degrees on a part-time basis.

Wayne State University—a true urban university—successfully combined its day and evening credit classes in one program some time ago. Northeastern University has just reorganized its program to achieve this; the University of Washington seems to be moving in this direction.

As this movement continues it may have the effect of "separating out" the informal educational and continuing education activities: service to groups, non-credit classes, etc. Whether the latter activities will tend to become peripheral to the university (i.e., to the "community of scholars"), or whether the move to make extension credit classes integral to the university can be considered a first step toward making all legitimate educational service and continuing education activities integral, will depend upon how some of the other issues—to be discussed below—are resolved.

Centralization versus Decentralization

Something about the very nature of a "community of scholars" naturally invites decentralization. Power gravitates to individual departments and schools. As universities grow in size, these tend to splinter off into smaller units. With the loss of a larger sense of purpose, individual scholars retreat into their specialities.

This faces universities with a painful problem when it comes to organizing themselves to discharge their service function. Should the extension division be essentially a "coordinating unit"—with responsibility for the planning of activities residing primarily in the schools and departments? Or an "operating unit"—with responsibility for planning residing in the extension division itself?

At Michigan State University, with a strong central university administration committed to making service a major function of the institution, there is a tendency toward centralization, toward "operation" rather than coordination. At the University of Michigan, which has a long tradition of decentralization, there is a tendency to make extension a coordinating mechanism.

At New York University, tendencies in both directions seem to be present. Tradition exerts a powerful impetus toward decentralization of the service function through the various schools and colleges. The Division of General Education and Extension Services, on the other hand, functions most effectively as an operating unit through which most of the non-credit class and group activities are handled; less effectively as a coordinating unit for other parts of the university.

Credit versus Non-credit Activities

Universities traditionally attempt to distinguish "serious" educational activities—those provided by the university proper—from those educational activities sponsored by the university in discharging its service function, by developing the former within a framework of curricula for which credit toward degrees is granted.

It is an open question whether the distinction is a valid one. Originally adopted as a device to protect the quality and kind of education given by the university, the credit system has now become almost an end in itself. So complex, so cumbersome to administer, so hedged about with regulations and restriction, so vulnerable to manipulation by special interests, the system now threatens the very process it was supposed to promote. Non-credit informal activities, particularly those that may be called "continuing education," have steadily improved in both content and method.

Except in connection with post-professional continuing education, however, most adults still seek some recognition for educational accomplishment. Three of the universities (all private, by the way) that I visited have, or are contemplating, special degree programs for adults: Harvard, Northeastern, and Columbia. NYU's Division of General Education is empowered to offer a two-year Associate in the Arts degree.

With the above-noted trend toward integration of regular credit courses given through extension into the university proper—the question of whether or not universities will encourage the offering of a special credit-toward-degree program for adults becomes more important. (In continuing education as in formal education, there is nothing wrong with a credit system as long as it is viewed as a tool. There is everything wrong with it considered as an end.)

Faculty Involvement in Service Activities

Faculty members in most universities have long been expected to teach in extension on an extra-time, "overload pay" basis. This has been an inexpensive way of getting the job done. (The pay scale is usually below the regular faculty member scale.) As a result, most extension teaching is done by instructors and assistant professors, many of whom do the extra teaching to supplement low salaries. This is a situation few like. It gives color to the charge that extension education is inferior to campus education; makes it difficult for extension directors to recruit good teachers; often wastes the time of young faculty members not interested in continuing education who might better be using their spare hours to improve their mastery of their chosen fields. Increased pay—on an "extra time" basis—does not get at the root of the difficulty.

On the other hand, integration of extension teaching into regular teaching would substantially increase over-all instructional loads of the departments and require additional subsidies, and probably increased fees.

Employment of qualified outside part-time instructors is another answer, but it leaves the university open to the charge that its program is not really an "extension" of the university's resources; it often becomes simply a broker in the educational process.

Self-supporting or Partially Subsidized?

For a long time most universities assumed that extension (i.e., service) activities should be self-supporting. Many enjoyed substantial "incomes" from this source with which parts of the regular program could be financed. This is still the case in all of the private universities I visited (except Harvard, whose Commission on Extension Services is partially subsidized by outside funds). State universities, on the other hand, provide subsidy for some extension services. In the state universities visited, the amount varied from six to sixty per cent of the total extension division budget.

The extent to which a policy of self-support acts as a limiting factor on the development of a sound well-balanced program, depends in part on the nature of the university. In a private university like New York University (which has a tradition of self-support for most of its activities[2]) a Division of General Education, with effective, imaginative leadership, and given freedom to "operate," can develop a sound and effective program embracing both educational services and continuing education.

On the other hand, the University of Michigan, itself a publicly supported institution with a mandate to provide some form of state-wide service, would be hopelessly handicapped if it had to make the provision of this service self-supporting.

Relations with Other Educational Institutions

When the university extension movement got under way a half century ago, there was little thought that the activities it chose to undertake in behalf of the general public—whether in the form of extension education, continuing education or miscellaneous educational services—had to be judged in terms either of their appropriateness to the "regular" work of the university, or of their relation to services performed by other educational agencies.

University resources that could be made available were pitifully limited. Public needs and interests were limitless. Most of the early extension directors were apparently inclined to agree with Reber of Wisconsin that extension activities bore little relationship to the activities carried on by the academic community. Extension was a freewheeling social service whose character and dimensions were limited only by the ingenuity, energy and resources available to the director.

Today the situation has changed. In the face of the rising demands being made on institutions of higher education, universities are beginning to ask themselves what functions are uniquely appropriate for them to perform. Inevitably this involves close scrutiny of the extension function. Are the activities "university level" in content and approach? Do they provide opportunities that could not be provided by other educational agencies?

---

[2] The original announcement of plans to form the University noted that professors were to depend for their salaries on fees from the students. Necessity for complete self-support, however, limits experimentation and constricts the capacity for making need innovations. Today we recognize the necessity for some endowment and continued subsidy for other aspects of university work—why not some endowment for continuing education?

There is no agreement on the answers, but one thing is clear. The effective provision of adequate educational opportunities for adults must increasingly, in the future, take on the character of a cooperative venture. Joint planning, among publicly supported educational institutions at least, is becoming a necessity. Either it will be done on a voluntary basis, with affected institutions setting up and running their own coordinating mechanism; or it will be done by legislative fiat, through the establishment of a coordinated and centrally controlled educational system.

Movement toward the coordination of publicly supported institutions of higher education was evident in three of the states visited: California, Michigan, and Illinois. In Oregon a coordinated system has been in existence for nearly thirty years. The effect of this movement upon the extension services of individual publicly supported universities is at the moment difficult to gauge. Hopefully it will bring about a reduction of some activities which extension divisions have sustained, often chiefly because they paid for themselves, and an increase in activities of real substance. Pessimistically, it may result in an arbitrary limitation on the university's power to participate in the needed continuing education of the adult population.

Some Conclusions

There can be no meaningful examination of "trends in continuing education" in universities, without some understanding of what is happening to the role of the university itself in society. On the title page of this report I quoted Abraham Flexner's challenge—thirty years ago—to the university. In these sometimes grim and confused days of change, and of forced adjustment to change, precipitated by blind technological advance, he said, "the weight and prestige of the university must be thrown on the side of intelligence." Before the university can "throw its weight on the side of intelligence" it will have to be intelligent about itself.

The "Community of Scholars": "Open" or "Closed"?

Throughout this report I have tried to adhere to the notion that the university is, in essence, a community of scholars dedicated to the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge.

History reveals that it has been chiefly a "closed" community, a "citadel of learning," at war with the larger community around it, subjected to pressures from both church and state. From its beginnings, the university extension movement constituted a challenge to this "closed community" concept. In a free society, it said in effect, the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge should be conducted within an ever widening circle of involvement; in which the university as an open community of scholars is at the center. For the virtues inherent in this community at its best are virtues that must—in a free society—be widely shared and practiced if that society is to survive.

Earlier I quoted Jacob Bronowski on the ideal characteristics of the Scientist, the leading "scholar" of our day. Let me quote him again on the nature of the "society of scientists":

"The society of scientists is simple because it has a directing purpose: to explore the truth. Nevertheless it has to solve the problems of every society, which is to find a compromise between man and men. It must encourage the single scientist to be independent, and the body of scientists to be tolerant.[3] From these basic conditions, which form the prime values, follows step by step the spectrum of values: dissent, freedom of thought and speech, justice, honor, human dignity and self-respect."[4]

The university—the "community of scholars"—cannot withdraw from involvement with the "frequently discordant affairs of public life and... highly competitive social endeavors." It no longer has a "choice" between being responsible for advanced teaching and research in an encapsulated academic environment—and being responsibly, intelligently committed (again to quote Ortega) to "intervention, as a university, in current affairs, treating the great issues of the day from its own point of view, cultural, professional, scientific." If it is to fulfill this commitment responsibly, it will also have to work to change society's attitude toward education. A "closed" community of scholars is an anomaly in a free society.

---

[3] Alexander Meiklejohn would say that the most significant thing about the tolerance exercised by the "society of scientists" is that it is the "tolerance of hope." "There are two kinds of toleration," he writes. "One of them springs from hope. The other springs from despair. The first is a form of intellectual cooperation. The second is a form of mutual non-interference. The toleration which arises from hope regards men as working in a common cause. . . ." The toleration that springs from despair "accepts differences of belief as final, as irreducible. It regards the minds of men not as working together, but as working separately and independently." Difference of views is "adjusted" by bargaining, "the practical man's way of avoiding trouble. I would not disparage too much the avoiding of trouble. . . . But to confuse the avoiding of trouble with the active creating of intellectual unity in the life of society is to lose all proper sense of intellectual values and intellectual possibilities." (Alexander Meiklejohn, Education Between Two Worlds [Harper and Bros., 1942], pp. 58-59.

[4] Jacob Bronowski, op. cit., pp. 87-88.

A "Four-Dimensional" Educational System

The phenomenal advances made in the realm of physics in the last half century have come about as a result of a revolution in the way of thinking about time and space. As long as physicists held to the Newtonian theory that time and space are absolute and independent realities, progress in the field was blocked. But once physicists began acting on Einstein's relativity theory, which described the universe as a four-dimensional continuum in which events are located by three space (position) coordinates and a time coordinate (the fourth dimension), things began to happen which have changed our whole world.

I suggest that, without the intervention of an Einstein, something comparable appears to be taking place in the field of education. Educationists have been operating on the "Newtonian" theory that "formal education" (with its three "dimensions": primary, secondary and higher education) and the concept variously designated as "informal education" or "adult education" are absolute and independent realities.

Much of the confusion which is now apparent in the university world —and in the world of formal education in general—can perhaps be explained by the notion that those responsible for the organization of education are attempting to adapt a "three-dimensional" system of education to a society which desperately needs a four-dimensional one. If we can look upon, and act upon, continuing education as the "time coordinate" in a new conception of education, the effect upon education, and upon society as a whole may well be as revolutionary as the original Einstein theory. For then we would be moving toward the establishment of what Paul McGhee once called the "learning society".

The confusion that surrounds the university's struggle with its "service" function, reflects attempts to rationalize needed changes in terms of the older framework. Educators, like everyone else, are loathe to give up the known comforts and rewards flowing from adherence to an established concept, for the unknown discomforts and personal sacrifices inherent in early attempts to operate under a new one.

Breakthroughs

Here and there notable—although too often isolated—breakthroughs are being made. The experimental Michigan State College at Oakland, which takes continuing education as a central concept for the whole higher education enterprise, and plans an "alumni college" to insure its constant presence, is one. The television-discussion experiment in civic education being conducted in St. Louis by Washington University is another. The proposed experimental College for Independent Study at New York University—which not only anticipates the abolition of the classroom, the central use of radio and television for lecture purposes and the prominent use of small group discussion, but also the extension of this educational program to adults—is still another. These may be viewed as breaches in the academic wall; ventilations of the closed community of scholars.

The wider use of television, which many educators still look upon with dismay, may well turn out to be the most potent of all aids in ushering in a truly four-dimensional educational system.

Old Values Need New Forms

The idea of a "four-dimensional" system of education is still, of course, just that: an idea. The present state of education has to be regarded (as so many remind us) as transitional. And it is not surprising that it is full of confusion, conflict, discouragement and apathy.

Two things are necessary if this period is to be successfully bridged: (1) a clear sense of the values (as distinct from the forms) to be preserved; and (2) the will and the courage to cooperate in the development of new social forms within which these values may find adequate expression in individual human living.

Statement of the values constitutes no problem. They are in essence those to which the "society of scientists" we previously mentioned render allegiance: respect for the dignity and the integrity of the individual, belief in human solidarity, in the right to dissent and the toleration of individual differences—all things, in brief, which have characterized the highest aspirations of the human enterprise as we know it. These are not only national purposes, but human purposes. Into work on their realization all humanity has ultimately to be drawn.

But cooperation in the development of new social forms in which these values may find expression is another matter. Powerful forces in our culture work constantly against meaningful cooperation. In a "free enterprise society" competitive practices which keep business alive and vital sometimes operate disastrously when carried over into the educational world, where the discipline of cooperation and dedication to a commonly shared purpose are essential.

Rate of Change Demands Cooperation

Yet the events which pace the rate of change demand cooperation. If it cannot be achieved voluntarily, the imposition of arbitrary, centralized coordination will be inevitable. As Flexner says, "Societies have to act—intelligently if possible—if not, then unintelligently, blindly, selfishly, impulsively."

Effective inter-institutional cooperation requires strong leadership. And it is here that the university—particularly the publicly supported university with state-wide obligations—can play an important role. Many universities, as we have seen, are already moving in this direction, albeit not with the greatest enthusiasm. California (needled by a Master Plan Committee) has a state-wide Liaison Committee; Michigan (prodded by the John Dale Russell report on higher education) has a Presidents' Committee on State-wide Field Services. But these bodies too often develop into glorified "grievance committees." Formed under duress, they frequently lack both the power and the will creatively to work on cooperatively conceived ventures.

It may very well be that what we are looking for may emerge from a joining of the two most powerful "movements" in adult education in recent years. These are the so-called community development movement and the movement for liberal adult education.

The first has been, in essence, a genuine "citizenship development" program; stressing the importance of restoring to the individual a "sense of community," training in the skills of "human relations," and seeing adult education largely as a matter of learning-through-community-action.

The second has stressed the importance of the individual as an individual; development—largely through group study-discussion—of the capacity for critical thinking and aesthetic appreciation: human excellence for its own sake.

Community Development and Liberal Adult Education

The community development movement began through the work of educators in small culturally and educationally "underdeveloped" communities, where they devised skills of helping people to help themselves in community improvement: building new schools, playgrounds, libraries; getting new health services; changing antiquated political structures, etc;

The movement for liberal adult education may be said to have gotten under way with the success of the Great Books discussion groups, but soon spread to include a wide range of activities with substantial intellectual and aesthetic content.

As the community development movement grew, it spread out of the small towns into the suburbs and cities and began to change in character as more complex problems were encountered. Study-discussion became an accepted method for groups in analyzing community problems. More and more it came to be realized that if individuals were to be effective citizens, they had to be effective individuals. It is significant that when the University of Washington launched its program of liberal arts seminars, its first "customers" were the products of the University's community development program.

The reverse is also true. Products of Kansas City's Great Books program spearheaded the drive for a renaissance in the political life of that community.

Some universities are attempting to combine the two approaches in special experiments. Wayne State University's recent ambitious project, "Detroit Adventure," sought to focus attention on the city's cultural offerings, involved a number of leading institutions in sponsorship, and provided a variety of liberal arts "learning situations" for adults in different parts of the city. But this "merger"—this welding of objectives needs some kind of "institutional" form to give it strength and stability.

Toward a Cooperative Urban Extension Service

By all odds the outstanding "adult education" venture in the United States is that handled under the auspices of the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service. It is well financed, has full-time trained personnel, reaches the bulk of the rural people in nearly every state in the union.

It has helped the farmer to upgrade himself economically, and to work with others in improving the quality of home and community living.

Today the farm population is declining. Farming, like everything, is undergoing its own industrial revolution. The population of the U.S.—as the incoming results of the 1960 census graphically reveal—is now predominantly an urban and suburban one, and growing rapidly.

In every one of the universities that I visited, the effect of this change was evident. The University of Illinois in Urbana was planning a new branch "urban university" for Chicago. The Oregon State System of Higher Education now includes a rapidly growing college in Portland, which is already enrolling more students than either of the older state universities. The University of Wisconsin has been forced to make its extension center in Milwaukee into a full-fledged University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee.

At the same time, the state universities are being forced to decentralize—to set up branches in smaller, growing urban regions, or to work with local community colleges to help raise standards.

Something new is stirring. I will cite three examples. Several years ago at the University of Illinois a Committee on Community Studies was set up, with a part-time executive. On this Committee, significantly enough, sit representatives of all units of the University conducting any kind of off-campus educational services. It includes—besides the Extension Division—the College of Education, the College of Fine and Applied Arts (which maintains a Bureau of Community Planning), the College of Business (which has a bureau of Business Management), the School of Music, the Institute of Government and Public Administration, the College of Agriculture (where the Agricultural Extension Service is located), and the Institute of Industrial and Labor Relations, and several other units. The ostensible purpose of the Committee is to insure communication among the various schools, colleges and institutes that are engaged in any way in work in local communities. In point of fact it has become a vehicle for mounting joint projects of one kind or another. It is an instrument for education in cooperation. All of the off-campus community projects of any kind clear through this Committee. Ideas for projects or services are frequently discussed here before they are undertaken. Unless I am very much mistaken, this Committee points the way to a future revision of the whole extension of the program of the University toward a new kind of college-and-department-based, internally coordinated, urban extension service.

At the University of Washington, where a Community Development Project has been in successful operation for the past eight years, an effort appears in the offing to integrate the staff, through joint appointments, into the various colleges and departments—political science, education, liberal arts and science, etc. The Community Development field people can then identify the problem communities outside the university and enlist appropriate colleagues on the faculty to help work on them.

The University of Wisconsin, with the assistance of a Ford Foundation grant, is preparing a pilot project to be carried on in two small Wisconsin urban areas which will also involve a partnership between extension field staff and regular faculty members.

The outlines of this emerging reorganization of the university are still fuzzy—but the direction is clear.

Won't this get the university into politics? Van Hise's reply to this question when the Wisconsin idea was first under way is pertinent today. "If . . . it is meant that the university is attempting to lead in the advancement of the people; if it is meant that problems which relate to water power, to forests, to marketing, to the public utilities, to labor, are legitimate fields of university inquiry and teaching, then the university is in politics."

This is indeed a sharpening of the definition of service. And if universities lived up to it, it could also be construed at last as a genuine expansion—a wider sharing—of those age-old purposes of the community of scholars: the pursuit of truth and the dissemination of knowledge.

What universities seem to be groping for today is a way of reorganizing themselves to meet a situation in which the problems of urban living, and the problems relating to the control and assimilation of the effects of the New Industrial Revolution, are paramount. In casting about for a model, many university administrators are looking with new interest at the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.

The organizational model provided by this Service is not something that can be slavishly copied.[5] But it embodies several principles that in any planning of any kind of *urban* extension service deserve serious attention.

The first is the notion of shared support. Funds should come from federal and state governments and probably from local and individual sources, as well. Shared support is shared control, and should assure flexibility of individual operation.

The second is the idea of close relationship between the university extension field staff and the regular faculty. The trend in this direction is apparent on most of the campuses that I visited. While complete "integration" is still in the distance—and may never be achieved in some institutions—it seems to me clearly on the way. The only real alternative—the development of a semi-independent "peripheral" unit—has many obvious disadvantages; it may be adopted in some of the privately supported universities, but is unlikely to be acted on by many publicly supported ones.

The third principle—an active policy of sharing projects with other agencies and organizations in achieving commonly identified educational goals—is the very essence of the cooperative extension idea. The ideal "cooperative extension system" would involve not only cooperative arrangements among universities, colleges and public schools, but also public libraries, museums, etc.

There is, of course, no ideal way to achieve the ideal. And the "ideal" itself will always take different forms. The battle to achieve it will have to be fought community by community, state by state, region by region.

A Closing Word

These conclusions may be briefly summarized as follows:

---

[5] The extent to which the present agricultural extension operation can be successfully merged with general university extension is already being tested out. The two have been merged in the University of Missouri, Kansas State University, and Utah State University, and perhaps other places I don't know about. Experiments looking to such a "merger" are under way in the University of California, the University of Illinois, in the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and Michigan State University. It has been my observation that where the Service is trying to maintain a separate function with the state university, it has had to move in the direction of becoming, in effect, a servant of agricultural economic interests.

The University in a free society faces the problem of how to make a break with the older concept of the "closed" community of scholars which it inherited from medieval days, and embrace the idea of an "open" community of scholars; how to persuade the "scholars" that they can only protect and nurture the central values of the "community of scholars" by undertaking to get them as widely shared as possible by all the people in the wider community in which it exists.

If this is to be done, it will have to be done as part of a new concept of education. The educational system, up to the present, has developed on a "three-dimensional" notion—primary, secondary, and higher education. This non-dynamic concept of discrete "terminal" units no longer meets the needs of the time. Continuing education—a "time coordinate" —needs to be added to the concept as a "fourth dimension," changing the relation of the parts to each other and giving a new look and meaning to the whole.

These, admittedly, are high-flying ideas which have no prospect of landing any place in the immediate future. Therefore, the most immediately practicable action a university could take in this direction would be to work for the establishment of something like a cooperative urban extension service, modeled in part after the successful Cooperative Agricultural Extension service.

I would sum up today's challenge to the university in this phrase: to work everlastingly at the task of making learning responsive to the people, and people responsive to learning.

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAY 21 1969
on Adult Education